The
Quarterly Journal
of the
Mythic Society

Vol. XXIV APRIL, 1934 No. 4

NOTES ON POPULAR RELIGION IN BIHAR

By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.

The Hindus of Bihar believe not only in the higher gods of the Hindu Pantheon, namely, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva, but also in a host of minor deities, consisting of godlings and goddesslings, whose names are neither mentioned in the Hindu works on mythology nor are they recognized and accepted by the orthodox Brahman hierarchy. These minor deities are not represented by anthropomorphic images and, being mostly of animistic origin, are of incorporeal essence. In order that they may be enabled to receive the offerings and libations presented by their votaries, they are represented by some sort of symbols. These symbols are, sometimes, a little heap of earth called a *pindi*; sometimes, a brick placed on a raised mound; sometimes, a log of wood; sometimes, a rough or unhewn stone; and, sometimes, a hewn stone; or even an old image. These are besmeared with vermilion; libations and offerings are made to the animistic deities they represent; and, occasionally, a pair of clogs and a small wooden seat are placed before them.

As regards the symbolising of these animistic deities by rough or unhewn stones, I may mention here that, in the district of Patna in South Bihar, there is a deity named Goraiyā whose worship is popular in that locality. He is a male hero of Dusādh origin, who is reported to have been the

chieftain of a band of robbers. In the songs sung in his honour, he is spoken of as a great warrior who came from Delhi with a handful of followers, and died fighting at Mehnawan near Sherpur in the Patna district, where his principal shrine is located. He is now worshipped throughout the district by the low-caste peoples, and even by some members of the higher castes such as Bābhans. *The usual representation or symbol of this godling is a stone or mound of earth under a tree outside the village*, before which offerings of goats, sweet stuffs, milk and clarified butter are presented to be taken away afterwards by the Dusādhs.

In Bihar the *Barham Daitya* or the spirit of a Brahuan who has met with a violent death, often becomes the tutelary deity or *dihwār* of the whole village. The worship of this godling is usually carried on under a tree, very often a banyan tree (*Ficus indica*), which he is supposed to reside in. The trunk thereof is besmeared with vermilion and *a mound of earth is erected*, on which are placed clay figurines of horses or elephants, and offerings are presented of flowers, betel-nuts and the like. The worship is performed by a special priest called the *Bhakta*, who is not necessarily a Brahman; and sometimes, he is inspired by this deity and utters prophecies which are implicitly believed in by the devotees.

Then, again, the district of Gaya is intimately connected with the rise and spread of Buddhism. Here Buddha, the great founder of Buddhism lived for a long time and promulgated the tenets of his religion. As the result of this, the district of Gaya is rich in Buddhist remains, namely, Buddhist images, *chaityas* or small shrines and other relics. The Hindus of this part of Bihar have appropriated these old images and *chaityas* and, after bedaubing them with vermilion, have conferred on these the names of some deities of animistic origin who are unknown to the orthodox Brahman priesthood. These new-fangled godlings and goddesslings, under new designations, are now worshipped and prayed to by the Hindus, especially of the lower classes.

On this point, Mr. L. S. S. O'Malley says:—

"Images of Buddha and other Buddhistic images and *chaityas* are found in temples of all kinds, under trees and in the open air in all parts of the district (Gaya), and are treated as different deities, *lingas*, etc. Such images have been enshrined in hundreds of temples, in temples of Śiva, of Mahādeva, of Viṣṇu, of the Sun, of Śitalā, the goddess of disease, and others. Hundreds of *chaityas* have similarly been set up in *Śivālayas* filling the places of *lingas*. But this is simply because these images and *chaityas* have been found lying about and have been utilized by the Hindus as images of their own deities or as the *linga* of Mahādeva. They are worshipped by the ignorant Hindus, not as Buddha or as Buddhistic emblems, but as their own gods and symbols.

"In the same way, stone images of Buddha dug up in the fields are not infrequently set up to represent the various evil spirits propitiated by the lower castes; but the worshippers do not know that they are Buddhistic images. There must be something tangible to represent a godling or even a malignant spirit, and the image is something tangible that will serve their purpose, as they can rub vermilion on it or pour a libation over it or sacrifice a fowl, goat or pig before it. In all cases, the rites are Hindu and not Buddhistic, and no traces of Buddhism are visible. At Bodh Gaya, it is true, the large stone image of Buddha on the ground-floor of the temple is worshipped by some low-caste Hindus in the neighbourhood; but this is a recent innovation and no orthodox Hindu thinks of doing so or regards the worship as anything but incongruous and spurious. In Gaya, as in other parts of Bengal, Buddhism is dead as a separate and current religion. It was a branch that sprouted from the tree of Hinduism, grew vigorously for a considerable period, and then withered off."* Then again, in North Bihar, especially in the district of Champaran, the Hindus have appropriated the famous edict-pillars erected by Asoka, the great Buddhist Emperor of India, dubbed them with Hindu names and worship them with Hindu rites.

---

* *Vide The Gazetteer of Gaya.* By L. S. S. O'Malley, I.C.S. Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, 1906. Page 74.

At the village named Lauriya Araraj in the district of Champaran, there is a famous edict-pillar which is worshipped and prayed to by the Hindu villagers on every day and every month of the year, according to the worshipper's sweet will and pleasure. It is known to the villagers of the locality as Bhim Singh Bābā. But the officiating priest and several other people of the neighbourhood stated to me that this godling was called Bhim Bali Bābā or the godling named Bhim the Strong.

Although the Asoka-pillar standing in the village of Lauriya Araraj is called Bhim Bali Bābā or "the godling named Bhim the Strong", there are two other pillars (erected by the Emperor Asoka) in the district of Champaran, which are called Bhim Singh's staff or *lāthi*.

Of these two pillars, one stands in the village of Lauriya Nandangarh which is situated in the Bettiah Sub-division of the district of Champaran and lies at a distance of fourteen miles to the north-west of the town of Bettiah. This pillar is also worshipped and prayed to by the Hindu villagers of the locality under the belief that it is a phallus or *lingam*. They call it Bhim Singh's staff (or *lāthi*) and present to it offerings of sweetmeats and fruits.

The other Asoka-pillar stands in Manza Rāmpurwā, a village situated close to that named Pipariyā which lies at a distance of thirty-two miles to the north of Bettiah. The Tharus of the locality call this Asoka-pillar by the name of Bhim's *lāthi* (or staff).

On a careful examination of the cults connected with the Asoka-pillars at Lauriya Araraj and Lauriya Nandangarh, I find that they are characterised by the undermentioned interesting features:—

(1) A Buddhist memorial or object of great historical interest has been looked upon with feelings of great veneration by the ignorant Hindu villagers of the countryside and has been gradually adopted by them as an object of their worship.

(2) Legends have been fabricated by the aforementioned Hindu villagers, whereby the origin of these stone pillars has

been very fancifully explained by the supposed connection thereof with a hero of the great Indian epic, the *Mahābhārata*.

As regards the point No. (1) *supra*, I may state that the evolution of the cult of the pillar-godling Laur Bābā is most likely to be attributed to the fact that, after the fall of Buddhism, the Hindus removed from the pages of their *Purāṇas* all historical accounts of Buddhism that were embodied in them and, at the very same time, altered all the legends and traditions of the country with the object of effacing all traces of Buddhism from the chronicles of India. In this connection, Dr. Dinesh Chandra Sen says:—

"In the temples, the images of Buddha were still worshipped, but the priests called him by the name of a Hindu god such as Śiva or Viṣṇu. In one place, I found an image of the Buddha worshipped under the name of the feminine deity Chaṇḍi. In the temple of Tilabhāndeśvara at Benares, a very glorious image of Buddha is called Jaṭāśankara or '*Śiva with knotted hair*'. The *Jaṭā* or knotted hair is nothing but a fig-tree under which Buddha attained Nirvāṇa. Though the Buddha is recognized by the Vaiṣṇavas as the ninth incarnation of Viṣṇu, the Hindus did not tolerate his worship or anything connected with Buddhism in this country during the early days of the Renaissance."*

Another characteristic of the popular religion in Bihar is the worship of natural phenomena. I have come across only one instance of it. The Pāsis of Bihar earn their livelihood by drawing toddy from the palmyra-palms by tapping the crown thereof and by selling this toddy. It is characteristic of this caste that they worship or present offerings to the east wind for the purpose of obtaining a copious flow of the toddy wine from the palmyra-palms they have tapped.†

---

* For a fuller discussion of the cult connected with the Asoka-pillars in the district of Champaran, see my paper entitled: *Studies in the Cults of the District of Champaran in North Bihar*, which has been published in *The Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* for March-June 1924.

† *Vide The Gazetteer of Patna*. By L. S. S. O'Malley, I.C.S. Revised Edition by J. F. W. James, I.C.S. Patna: Superintendent of Bihar and Orissa Government Printing, 1924. Page 57.

IS THE ADVAITA OF ŚANKARA BUDDHISM IN DISGUISE?

By G. V. Budhakar, B.A. (Hons.)

(*Continued from Vol. XXIV, No. 3, p. 265*)

Side by side with the Pāncharātrins there are the Bhāgavatas referred to in the *Harṣacharita* (8. 5, p. 220). Can they be those, who unlike the Pāncharātrins, were liberal worshippers of Viṣṇu and who professed the Advaita of the type, which Śankara maintains in philosophy and followed "भाक्ति" and "कर्म" in life. Śankara calls his system, "भागवतं मतं" thrice (18. 48) and "औपनिषदं दर्शनं" (13. 31) in his commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*. He is very near such a school. In his commentaries there are references to "शालिग्राम" and "विष्णुप्रतिमा" (भ. गी. भा. 4. 24; ब्र. सू. भा. 1. 3. 14, 1. 2. 14, 1. 2. 7, 3. 3. 9, 4. 1. 3, 4. 1. 5; छां. उ. भा. 8. 1. 1, 6. 16. 2 or 3; बृ. आ. उ. भा. 1. 3. 1, 3. 7. 3, to नारायण 5. 1. 1; तै. उ. भा. 1. 6. 1, 1. 8; प्र. उ. भा. 5. 2). He begins his commentary on the *Gītā* with great regard to Śrī Kṛṣṇa. Yet his open mind is prepared to respect the old Vedic "पंचायतनपूजा" (आश्व. गृ. सू. प. 2. 10) as it is stated by him in his commentary on the Kenopaniṣad (1. 5. पदभाष्य) thus:—उपास्यः विष्णुरीश्वरः इन्द्रः प्राणो वा ब्रह्म भवितुमर्हति ।. Besides he has composed many hymns in praise of different gods and goddesses. Prior to Śankara there was such a school; because the *Vaikhānas Gri. Sūtra*, which is referred to by Viśvarūpa (*Yā. Śmri.* Com., 3. 3. 46) and Medhātithi (*Manu Śmri.* Com., 6. 21) is completely monist in philosophy and is devoted to Viṣṇu (*Vaik. Gri. Sūtra*, 1. 9; 4. 10; 1. 5; 1. 7; 2. 4; 3. 7). In 8. 9 it says that the Advaita is the highest end:—

क्षेत्रज्ञपरमात्मनो योगं ज्ञात्वा यदतीन्द्रियं सर्वजगद्बीजमशेषविशेष नित्यानन्दममृतरसपानवत्सर्वदातृप्तिकरं परं ज्योतिस्तत्प्रवेशकं इति ज्ञायते ।

This school might be of the Vaikhānasas or Bhâgavatas. Ānandagiri in his *Śankaravijaya* has the following verse, which refers to these Vaikhānasas:—

भक्ता भागवताश्चैव वैष्णवाः पांचरात्रिणः ।
वैखानसाः कर्महीनाः षड्विधा वैष्णवा मताः ॥ ch. 6.

It is not known what the source of this verse is but from the reference given just now the distinctions among the Vaiṣṇavas are clear. The Pāncharātrins alone were not the Vaiṣṇavas nor "भक्ति" was their special property. They say that Śankara is a dry philosopher and a cold logical juggler. If by "भक्ति" they mean that it is unbridled sentimental excess Śankara is not surely a devotee of that type. In him reason and sentiment are combined and well balanced. He has reasoned faith. The different poetic and pathetic appeals he makes to religious aspirants sound like impassioned prose. They are both mystical and sincerely devotional. They are in his commentaries on the *Brihadāraṇyaka* (4. 3. 35; 4. 4. 2), *Chhāndogya* (6. 14. 2), *Mundaka* (1. 2. 12; 3. 1. 2), *Aitareya* (2. 1), *Praśna* (5. 1-2; 6. 8), *Kaṭha* (6. 1), *Bh. Gītā* (10. 11). He accepts the necessity of "भक्ति" or "सगुणोपासना" to as a step his Advaita. This is clear from his following allusions:—

भक्तिप्रसादं स्नेहाभिषिक्तेन । भ. गी. भा. 10. 11.

जपोपवासदेवताराधनादिभिः । ब्र. सू. भा. 3. 4. 38.

विष्ण्वादिप्रतिमास्थानीये भक्त्यावेशितब्रह्मभावे । प्र. उ. भा. 5. 2.

तस्मान्मुमुक्षु र्देवाराधनपरः श्रद्धाभक्तिपरः· · · · स्यात् ।

बृ. आ. उ. भा. 1. 4. 10.

इति श्रद्धाभक्तिभ्यां भावविशेषेण चोंकार आवेशयति । बृ.आ.उ.भा. 5. 1. 1.

His hymns are famous for their ardent devotion. He combines in him deep philosophical thought, subtle reasoning, and acute as well as constructive dialectic with the simple poetical pathos of a true devotee. As a philosopher he handles the most abstruse and philosophical topics with masterly ease and accuracy. His remarks as a serious metaphysician and constructive philosopher are illuminating and instructive in the following lines:—

न तु अन्तरालकल्पनायां प्रमाणमस्ति । बृ. आ. उ. भा. 4. 4. 7.

न च वस्तुनोऽर्धजरतीयत्वं कल्पयितुं युक्तं तत्त्वज्ञानविवक्षायाम् । . . . .

. . . . अतो न संशयितोऽर्थः . . . . वाच्यः परहितार्थिना ।

बृ. आ. उ. भा. 1. 4. 10.

न चैतच्छद्मरूपेण वाक्येन रक्षणीयं वस्तु । भ. गी. भा. 4. 18.

There are similar remarks in his commentaries on the *Praśna* (6. 3) and *Māndūkya-Kārika* (3. 17-18) Upaniṣads. In all these, he is definite and unequivocal. He always breathes sane and healthy reasoning. His style also is simple yet grand, and graceful and full of perspicuity. Here we cannot but quote the words of an eminent Indian scholar: "Fascinating, weird music; lucid, chaste, powerful, balanced expression; universal, unsectarian, fearless, loving expression; —these are some of the characteristics of his varied literary style. He was a real master of the philosophy he preached; he can express it in half a verse or a quarto volume of many hundred pages. He would readily break a lance with any adversary, atheist, materialist, ritualist, magician, ascetic, Yogi, or Tāntric".* The charge that a philosopher can never be a poet or in other words "भक्ति" cannot be reconciled with "ज्ञान" in life is stoutly disproved by Śankara and Madhusūdana Sarasvati. The latter was the author of अद्वैतसिद्धि and भक्तिरसायन. We have dealt with this point here at great length to disprove the belief held in some quarters that Śankara in his dialectical zeal has thrown theism overboard. He accepts it as a necessary step but does not exalt it at the cost of the Highest Ideal. From the foregoing discussion, it must have been clear that the Sūtrakār's main responsibility was to codify the teaching of the Upaniṣads in its entire aspect and that of a commentator to elucidate and give the exposition of the same. If both of them have achieved this task satisfactorily they are held authoritative. They have no independent value. Their codification and exposition should make the nearest possible approach to the teaching of the Upaniṣads. We have shown above that both the Sūtrakār and Śankara have discharged

* M. N. Dvivedi's *Imitations of Śankara*, Intro., p. ix.

their duties quite ably and faithfully. The commentators like Bhartṛprapancha, Bhāskara and others have laid great emphasis on qualified monism and distorted the passages, which go against their view. It is also brought to notice that the Pāncharātrins tried to superimpose their views on the sūtras although the Sūtrakār directed his polemics against them. What then was the view of the Sūtrakār as understood by the people beginning from the Vaiśeṣikas down up to the Pāncharātrins, whose views he attacks? Many modern scholars think that on account of the sketchy and enigmatic wording of the sūtras it is very difficult to find out the original intention of the author or to come to any definite conclusion. If this is really so, no interpretation of the sūtras which they give can be meant by the author. The different schools, which the author criticizes, are unanimous in ascribing a definite view to him when they attack him in their works. All of them agree with the view that he is systematising the Brahmādvaita of the Upaniṣads. This is what Śankara expounds. The author of *Vyāsatātparyanirṇaya* has dealt with it to some extent. But he has omitted the Buddhists and Jains.

It is necessary to make the philosophical and religious outlooks of both these schools clear so that we can understand the baselessness of the charge that Śankara's philosophy is simply Buddhism in disguise. Those, who bring this charge, are realists. They want to keep for ever the distinction between subject and object. They are afraid of the idea of getting themselves merged into the Boundless lest they should lose their individuality. They want that God, the world, and individual souls should be three distinct realities for ever. They are satisfied with this lot and question the possibility of any standpoint higher than this. In short, to them taste is truth. They want to read reality in terms of their taste. This they want to emphasise as ultimate and final. But Śankara says that truth is not always pleasant or agreeable. Those who have not got sufficient moral equipment and mental ability should stick to this goal. But those, who have keen and penetrating intellect, complete ethical preparation,

and a heart that is full of noble sentiments at once take up the high jump and merge themselves into the Eternal to gain immensely and immeasurably. In his commentary on the *Praśna* Upaniṣad (4·10) Śankara thus observes:— यस्तु सर्वत्यागी (सः) सर्वज्ञः ।. To him truth is not momentary emotionalism limited by narrow individualism. But it is the eternal and never-ending Bliss Itself with which one can never part. It is perfect Bliss, Knowledge, and Existence. He arrives at this with the rigorous logic of philosophers and the highest mystical experience. At this stage the proper interpretation and import of scriptural passages are actually realized without the help of learnedly ignorant explanations. Thus the triology of the highest spiritual experience, the absolutistic scriptural passages in the Upaniṣads and other works, and the logical transcendentalism of philosophers stands on an invisible and unimpeachable height where the attacks of realists and theists are aimless and misdirected.

This dizzy height is bound to be negative and unrealizable for ordinary men. Śankara anticipates this objection in his commentary on the *Chhāndogya* (8. 1. 1):—

दिग्देशजाति फलभेदशून्यं हि परमार्थसदद्वयं ब्रह्म मन्दबुद्धीनामसदिव प्रतिभाति ।

When the realists and theists confound the standpoint of Śankara with Buddhistic nihilism and dry idealism, they mean it in this sense. We have already made the subtle and metaphysical distinction clear. Unlike the two Buddhist schools he accepts the relative reality of the world. He neither establishes nor demolishes the question of creation. He accepts it as it is but the ultimate inquiry, he says, is beyond human reason. It is, therefore, wise to realize the Brahman, the fountainhead of all mystical and metaphysical goal, where the question of dualism or causation is māyā. It is no use indulging in aimless speculation. He observes:—

अतीतकोटिरहितस्य संसारस्यान्तवत्वं समाप्तिर्न सेत्स्यति युक्तितः ।

मां. का. भा. 4.30.

In his commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (2. 4. 11) he gives the dissolution of the external world as "विषयस्य प्रलयक्रमः"

and then proceeds to do the same in the case of the subjective one as "ब्रह्मविदां आत्यन्तिको बुद्धिपूर्वकः". This could not have been possible had he not taken the internal as well as external worlds to be relatively real. His words are clear and definite. In spite of all these evidences if the theists were to persist in levelling the charge, it is not the fault of the Advaita as it is not the fault of a post if a blind man gets his head knocked down against it. His systematic and eclectic genius has made him embrace all the lower ideals and aspirations according to necessity and sincerity before realizing the Vedantic consummation. It is just now shown that "भक्ति" is accepted by him as a step prior to "ज्ञान". He goes a step further and accepts Vedic ritualism as the first step in religious life before one has devotion. It should be observed disinterestedly. He speaks of this thus,

एवं कर्मकाण्डेनास्यैकवाक्यतावगतिः । बृ. आ. उ. भा. 4. 4. 22.

अग्निहोत्रादीनां च वैदिकानां कर्मणां अर्थवत्वात् । छां. उ. भा. 6. 11. 3.

Side by side with this he advises moral virtues in *Br. Sūtra* Com., 3. 4. 26-27. He is also aware of the fact that there are many who do not take religion seriously. They are satisfied with give-and-take ethics. They may direct Vedic ritualism to that purpose to fulfil their various worldly expectations. He says,

प्रायेण हि पुरुषाः कामबहुलाः । बृ. आ. उ. भा. 4. 5. 15.

Thus they can be active and obliging members in society. Śankara takes into consideration the diversity of human nature and has meted out religious ideals to that effect. The following quotation makes this point clear:—

तस्मात्पुरुषमतिवैचित्र्यमपेक्ष्य साध्यसाधनसंबंधविशेषाननेकधा उपदिशति (शास्त्रम्) । बृ. आ. उ. भा. 2. 1. 20.

Even in the case of asceticism or सन्यास his views are worth noting. He leaves to aspirant's sincerity, earnestness and ability to bear the burden of the rigid view. He observes,

तस्मात्पुरुषसामर्थ्यज्ञानवैराग्यकामाद्यपेक्षया व्युत्थानविकल्पक्रमपरिव्राज्यप्रतिपत्तिप्रकारा न विरुध्यन्ते । बृ. आ. उ. भा. 4. 5. 15.

He does not enforce it on all alike. Whenever he attacks the "ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयवाद" he means that it cannot be reconciled with the highest mystical experience in Samādhi. In his *Chhāndogya* Com. (2. 31. 1) he gives the meaning of "नैष्कर्म्य" according to his view and compares it with those of others. The question of quietism or activism is of different values. Activism is alright for socio-political and such other affairs in life. But the highest mystical and metaphysical goal is perfect tranquillity and grand serenity. If we examine all the passages in his Com. on the *Bhagavad-Gītā* (2. 10 and 21; 3 Intro.; 3. 20; 4. 15; 4. 18–24; 5. 1 Intro.; and 18. 66) we find that he strongly combats the view that rituals are necessary when one has realized the highest goal. To reach this stage, he says, actions either spiritual such as ritualistic performed disinterestedly or secular such as charitable and social are absolutely necessary. In the *Bhagavad-Gītā* Com. (3. 27 and 2. 46) he maintains that,

> कर्माणि लौकिकानि शास्त्रीयाणि ; and तस्मात्प्राग्ज्ञाननिष्ठाधिकारप्राप्ते कर्मणि अधिकृतेन कूपतडागादि-अर्थस्थानीयमपि कर्म कर्तव्यम् ।

A liberated soul may work to set an example or for the spiritual good of humanity. But its activity is not "कर्म" in the technical sense; because it has lost all the force of attachment though outwardly to the ignorant it might appear to possess it. In spite of all this it is not bound to undertake any activity; because it is beyond any interdependent obligation, self-aggrandising motives, and idealized human interest. This should not be stamped with the stigma of pious indolence. Śankara has clearly stated this in his *Chhāndogya* Com. (2. 23. 1; 3. 6. 2),

> यच्चाङ्गैरलसतया अकर्तृत्वाभ्युपगमः सोऽप्यसत् कारकबुद्धेः अनिवर्तितत्वात्प्रमाणेन । and न ह्यनुत्साहवतां अननुतिष्ठतां अलसानां भोगप्राप्तिः लोके दृष्टा ।

Man can serve humanity not only physically and mentally but spiritually as well. In the third case he transcends both indolence and activity. Milton rightly remarks that, "They alse serve who only stand and wait." These are three different

standards of values. Śankara never disturbs them. His comprehensive and all-embracing outlook can be seen when we read his *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (2. 1. 20) and *Bhagavad-Gītā* (13. 2) commentaries. He never asks to unsettle anybody. Let one stand where one desires and deserves. From there let one follow the ideal which suits one. Śankara has given the ladder of religious evolution ascending the steps of which in the proper manner one can reach the highest ideal. He greets all according to their sincerity. He rejects none. He is a practical idealist. He is not prepared to make the highest ideal popular. He is fully aware of the line, "सर्वस्य सर्वं न प्रियं हितं वा". He says that there may be some exceptional people, who can realize the highest ideal without any external help (*Tai. Up.* Com. 1. 11, *Br. Sut.* Com. 3. 4. 38). In the case of the majority, cultural and socio-religious conventions are of great importance. He is, therefore, not merely ascetical and other-worldly. His conception of " धर्म " includes social well-being also. This is in his *Bh.-Gītā* Com. 4. 7 and 4. 1 where he says,

"धर्मस्य हि वर्णाश्रमादि लक्षणस्य प्राणिनामभ्युदयनिश्रेयससाधनस्य।"

"ब्रह्मक्षत्रे परिपालिते जगत्परिपालयितुमलम् ।"

To safeguard the double interest, he believes not only in soul force but in martial force also. We have dealt with this outlook of Vedicism in life and religion while comparing it with that of Buddha. Śankara has faithfully and properly interpreted it without dragging it down to lower and mere utilitarian purposes. In spite of all this if one were to call him a hidden Buddhist it is simply betraying one's prejudice against him. It means that, "Prejudice prevails where judgment is lacking."

III

Since the introduction of modern research and comparative study a new outlook is coming into existence. The methods and arguments of this study are fine and fascinating. It takes into account the historical evolution of religion and philosophy. It lays emphasis on induction and generalization.

It has infused a new spirit into chronology. This new critical method has demolished many a chronological absurdity. Rightly has it shown that by neglecting the question of time and authorship, orthodcx scholarship has created a chronological chaos. These things, though culturally unimportant, have some value for the sake of historical accuracy. It has made men think before they accept anything. Blind and superstitious faith is blown away. Thus far we can take it as our guide. But when it goes a step further and tries to enter boldly and presumptuously into regions which are foreign to its activities, it is necessary to be free from its alluring airs and to expose its worthlessness and shortcomings. Its main defect is that, as yet, it is not convinced of the fact that behind the historical vicissitudes, in religion and philosophy, there is the under-current of culture ever present. The personality of modern critics often gives a different colouring to facts. This fact is noted by Oswald Spengler in his *Decline of the West*, where he observes, ". . . . present-day historians . . . . believe themselves to have already grasped History, the happening, the becoming self. This is a prejudice common to all who proceed by reason and cognition as against intuitive perception" (Vol. I, Intro. p. 48). He further observes, "But, even to-day, it is only forms of it that we know and not *the* form of it, which is the mirror image of our own inner life" (*ibid.*, Intro. p. 16). According to the exigency of time different elements in religion may predominate as far as their external or social application is concerned. But the main thought is always there. If this is not borne in mind, mere historical study means nothing more than putting together disconnected pieces. There may be great art but there would be no heart. Mere superficial observation and cataloguing are neither here nor there. Orthodox scholarship treats of being without becoming; while this scholarship speaks of becoming without being. Both are partial and imperfect. Again with the help of its petrified outlook this scholarship dissects different scriptures in the world to pieces and tries to allot different periods for their composition. Thus it tries to trace the

origin, growth and development of a particular religion. What does not stand to its test is declared as an interpolation. We do not absolutely deny the possibility of interpolations. But it makes one suspect the motive and sincerity of this scholarship when they are intentionally invented. With the help of its present attempts if it tries to maintain that religious growth is necessarily chronological we have to assert that it is in the infancy of its activities and achievements. Even in the Vedic period there were men as highly advanced in spirituality as Śankara and Buddha. The question of the first beginning is unknown to Indian culture. It believes that every evolution is followed by involution and *vice versa.* The whole current of religious life may run, at times, smoothly and silently due to its influence and popularity or, at times, with vigorous self-expression and pristine purity due to the opposition from other contending forces or several corroding and disintegrating factors, that are acting against it on account of its being misrepresented in the hands of its later followers, wanting in sincerity and steadfast loyalty to the ideal aimed at. But the dynamic self-expression and reassertion of it in the hands of any illustrious and towering personality is not a sudden appearance without any connecting link or continued historicity. Intuitive experience takes its stand on the Highest Ideal and systematises all the other aspects as the different stages leading to "It". They are true for all times and climes. In the absence of this inner and deeper understanding the so-called historical criticism at the best can be a mere patchwork of meaningless jargon and learned uncertainty. The author of *Vākyapadīya* says the same thing in the following lines :—

हस्तस्पर्शादिबाधेन विषमेऽप्यभिधावता ।
अनुमानप्रधानेन विनिपातो न दुर्लभः ॥ 1.42.

It is true that this scholarship made men think. But it does not seem to hold that in matters that transcend thought mere thinking stops short of its boasted claims. With the help of keen reasoning it has knocked down faith. But it has not substituted in its place anything that can give permanent

satisfaction, solace, and salvation. In its comparative zeal this scholarship is often satisfied with apparent similarities and external data. As in the West so here in India it understands that different philosophical views are cold logical dogmas shorn off from their spiritual and ethical implications. But the moment they call their interpretations purely logical their spiritual claims are gone, because logic can never lead one to definite results in spirituality as the following line remarks :—तर्के नैवास्ति निश्चयः ।. Its realization gives the greatest reward that surpasses all strength and joy. It means that knowledge is power. Śankara in his commentary on the *Kenopaniṣad* (2. 4) says :—

स्वेनरूपेण लभते सामर्थ्यं, धनसहायमंत्रौषधितपोयोगकृतं वीर्यं मृत्युं न शक्नोत्यभिभवितुं।

On this ideal depend many questions of vital importance. It is the standard of religious values that justifies the relative merits of any philosophical system in India. Logically no system can be perfect or faultless. Bhartṛhari in his *Vākyapadīya* says to the same effect thus :—

यत्नेनानुमितोऽप्यर्थः कुशलैरनुमातृभिः ।
अभियुक्ततरैरन्यै रन्यथैवोपपद्यते ॥ 1. 34.

It is not, therefore, unnatural if the followers of orthodox commentators look upon these modern authorities as utterly hopeless and unreliable guides in their field. Śankara says the same thing thus :—

असंप्रदायवित्सर्वशास्त्रविदपि मूर्खवदेव उपेक्षणीयः । भ. गी. भा. 13. 2.

There is the other line of orthodox commentators who systematise the different stages of spiritual progress and bring out the Highest Ideal more clearly. All the previous stages, they say, are different steps leading to it. They sort the different passages of the *Upaniṣads*, *Brahma Sūtras* and *Bhagavad-Gītā* and interpret them so as to make these stages of realization clear. These stages cannot be called inconsistent or absurd; because experience justifies them. Mystics demonstrate them. These commentators say that consistency is true

as far as thought is concerned and maintain that all the systems of philosophy in India, either Vedic or semi-Vedic, do not take their stand purely on discursive reason. They take the help of logic to make their mystical or metaphysical position intelligible as Śankara observes:—

वेदान्तार्थतत्त्वमेकत्वदर्शनं प्रत्यादरवन्तो मुमुक्षवः स्युरिति किंचिदुच्यतेऽस्माभिः, नतु तार्किकवत्तात्पर्येण । प्र. उ. भा. 6. 3.

He strictly follows this other line of commentators. Modern scholars should better take the orthodox commentators as their guides in cultural questions if they are spiritually serious and not indulging in intellectual pastime. In this connection we quote the words of M. Paul Masson Orsel, an eminent French Orientalist of reputation who read his paper, "What Contemporary Europe can learn from India?", in French at a meeting of the Schopenhaur Society in Germany.

"Again our historical method which Indians learn from us because it tends to reveal to them their own past, also often appears, in many directions, in discord with the principles of India. Sometimes summary and sometimes hypercritical our method often judges the East on the basis of Western standards and estimates the past on the basis of the present. Too often this method slights the historical element in traditions, because it was considered by us as a war engine against tradition. Too often it projects our peculiar obsession and pseudo-scientific postulates into other milieus. Thus, because we are convinced that things are in a state of evolution, we shut our eyes to the relative fixity of Eastern Societies, and we wish that questions of chronology may have as much importance in Asia, as in the last few centuries in the West. Owing to our indifference to religious values, we appraise only the linguistic significance of religious texts, and hence we reach but the letter and not the spirit. India does not excuse for this fault, which is all the more serious in her eyes because we appear to boast of knowing India better than Indians themselves."*

---

* *Prabuddha-Bhārata*, p. 36, Jan. 1930.

For the purpose of this paper we have relied on Śankara's genuine works, *viz.*, his commentaries on the *Brahma-Sūtras*, *Bhagavad-Gīta* and ten principal Upaniṣads and *Upadeśasāhasri*. It is not possible to say anything definitely about the other works included in the Vaṇi Vilas Memorial Edition. As regards his *Vākya*-commentary on the *Kenopaniṣad* we have our serious doubts although Ānandagiri has ascribed it to him. On the passage "उपनिषद्ब्राह्मीं (के. उ. 4. 7)" Śankara in his *Pada-Bhāṣya* says, "ब्राह्मीं ब्रह्मणः परमात्मनः इयं तां". This is quite in keeping with the context. But the *Vākya-Bhāṣya* remarks "ब्रह्मणो ब्राह्मणजातेरुपनिषदम्". This interpretation has nothing to do with the context. One of the commentators, who preceded Śankara, while commenting on "अथाऽतो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा" (ब्र. सू. 1. 1. 1.) gave such an interpretation. But Padmapāda in his *Panchapadikā* rejected this as absurd in the following lines:—

तत्र यदन्यैर्वृत्तिकारैः ब्रह्मशब्दस्यार्थान्तरमाशङ्क्य निरस्यते,

न खलु ब्राह्मणजातिरिह गृह्यते प्रत्यक्षसिद्धत्वात् जिज्ञास्यत्वाभावात् । P. 64.

When Padmapāda in the presence of Śankara discarded this interpretation, it is unnatural to expect that Śankara should accept it in the *Vākya-Bhāṣya*. Śankara also rejects this irrelevant explanation thus:—

अत एव न ब्रह्मशब्दस्य जात्याद्यर्थान्तरमाशङ्कितव्यम् । ब्र. सू. भा. 1. 1. 1.

It, therefore, follows that the *Pada-Bhāṣya* is his genuine work and the *Vākya-Bhāṣya* is from the pen of somebody else.

We have exhausted all the available information on this subject, and we hope that critics and scholars will throw fresh light on this subject.

The heading of this article is suggested by five articles, *viz.*, गौडपाद बौद्ध हताके? (गुजराती दिवाळी अंक 1925), The Māyāvāda (*Jn. of the Department of Letters*, Vol. XIX, 1929, pp. 76-78, Cal. Uni.), the "Schools of Vedānta" (pp. 30-40, the वसन्त रजत स्मारक अंक), "Vedanta Vindicated", Trichinopoly (*Q.J.M.S.*, Vol. XXII, p. 497). But they have not treated the subject in full details. Hence this attempt to treat this subject systematically and exhaustively.

DATE OF "ISHTASIDDHI"—II

BY C. HAYAVADANA RAO, B.A., B.L.

IN the first part of this article I suggested that *Ishtasiddhi* should have been written somewhere about 1050–1100 A.D. The note in which this deduction was first made was drawn up in November 1931, and in publishing it in a recent issue of this *Journal*, I have advisedly not altered its substance. Since then Mr. M. Hiriyanna has published his contribution on this identical subject in a recent issue of the *Madras Journal of Oriental Research* (Vol. IV, October-December 1931, 323–332). He very kindly furnished me with a MS. copy of his contribution in advance and I have had it and a reprint of the published article, also courteously forwarded by him, under study for some time now. In this part of my article on the same topic, I propose to examine at some length Mr. Hiriyanna's conclusion that there is reason to believe that the author of *Ishtasiddhi* should be set down to about 850 A.D. The main grounds on which Mr. Hiriyanna bases his conclusion may briefly be referred to here. He states that Rāmānuja draws his criticism of the Advaita System "solely from" the *Ishtasiddhi* and accordingly should have been fully acquainted with that work. Not only is this inference possible from a study of his *mahā-pūrva-paksha* but also from the very "phrases and turns of expressions which Rāmānuja takes from the *Ishtasiddhi*". "The word *Anubhūti*," he adds, "which he (Rāmānuja) so frequently uses in this connection in the sense of Brahman is taken from it." Mr. Hiriyanna further quotes the authority of Vedānta Dēsika, a commentator on Rāmānuja, who belonged to the fourteenth century A.D., in confirmation of this view. Vedānta Dēsika in his *Tattva-tīka*, an incomplete commentary on Rāmānuja's *Srībhāshya*, cites the first stanza of the *Ishtasiddhi* and remarks that the *mahā-pūrva-paksha* of Rāmānuja is in accordance with the arguments put forth in it. Mr. Hiriyanna also cites other references to *Ishtasiddhi* but none of these except one carry us further back than Rāmānuja. The exception refers to Yāmunāchārya, described as the *paramaguru* of Rāmānuja.

Yāmuna quotes the first verse in *Ishtasiddhi* and attempts to refute the position taken in it. It is this very verse, as stated above, which Rāmānuja also notices in his *Srībhāshya*. This reference helps us, as suggested by Mr. Hiriyanna, to shift the existence of *Ishtasiddhi* as a work of known authority to Yāmuna's time, say 1100 A.D.,[19] Rāmānuja having

[19] Yāmunāchārya is said to have been born in the cyclic year Dhātu, Kaliyuga 4017, at Vīranārāyaṇapura and to have died at Srīrangam. The *Tengalai Guru-paramparai* (Edition, 1880) states that he lived for 125 years. The *Prapannāmrita* describes him as the son of Īsvara Bhatta and Ranganāyaki and gives Kaliyuga 3657 as the year of his birth. The difference between these two authorities, as regards the date of Yāmuna's birth, is 360 years. As the beginning of the initial year of the Kaliyuga era has been placed on the 13th February 3102 B.C., the first of the dates mentioned above works out to 915-916 A.D., and if Yāmuna did live 125 years, he would have survived into 1040 A.D. The date given by the *Prapannāmrita* (Kaliyuga 3357) works out to 555-556 A.D., which seems too early for him. As Yāmuna in his *Siddhi Traya* refers to the Chōla king reigning in his time as the all-powerful *Samrāt* (*Yatha Chōla nripaḥ Samrāt' dvitīyō'sti bhutalē*, etc.), it is possible to fix his date, within certain possible limits. It has been suggested that the Chōla king referred to should be identified with Rājarāja the Great, who ruled from about 985 to 1013 A.D. [See T. Rajagopalachar's *Vaishnavite Reformers of India*, p. 36; "Yamunāchārya," *Indian Review*, IX (1908), p. 585, *et seq.*] This would separate him from Rāmānuja, his disciple's disciple, by about a century. But as tradition describes Yāmuna as a contemporary of Rāmānuja and makes the latter his successor at Srīrangam, this cannot prove acceptable. The Chōla king referred to in the *Siddhi Traya* should, therefore, have been Rājēndra-Chōla I, an equally 'great' Chōla king, who extended the Chōla Empire to Bengal, Central Provinces, Kanauj in the Ganges Valley, Assam, Pegu in Burma, Sumatra and Java and even sent an embassy to China, and was thus really a great *Samrāt*, fulfilling more literally the impressive description of Yāmuna than even his father. Rājēndra-Chōla I ruled from about 1013 to 1045 A.D. (See *Mysore Gazetteer*, New Edition, II. ii.). This would separate him from Rāmānuja by about 59 years (taking that Rāmānuja was already in existence in 1104 A.D., the initial year of the reign of Vishṇu-Vardhana, the Hoysala king). This date would make Yāmuna an elder contemporary of Rāmānuja, as described in the traditional accounts of his life enshrined in the Vaishnavite works above referred to. The date to which we should assign Yāmuna would thus be about 1100 A.D.

Mr. Rajagopalachariar writes in his *Vaishnavite Reformers of India* (p. 36) as follows:—"The *Siddhi Traya* is quoted frequently by Rāmānuja and no doubt was largely the basis of his able refutations of Śankara's views in the *Śrī Bhāshya*." This does not appear to be strictly correct, for Yāmuna is not mentioned by name by Rāmānuja in his *Śrī Bhāshya*. Though this is so, it is clear he was aware of Yāmuna's writings and in his *Srī Bhāshya* uses Yāmuna's arguments to advantage. He adopts his views rather than differ from them. On the other hand, he mentions Yādavaprakāsa by name but dissents from his views.

belonged to the period of the Hoysala king Vishṇu-Vardhana, who ruled from 1104 to 1141 A.D.[20] These citations in Rāmānuja and Yāmuna, adverted to by Mr. Hiriyanna, enable us also to infer that *Ishtasiddhi* was, about the beginning of the twelfth century A.D., a recognized text-book on the Advaita doctrine. The fact—mentioned by Mr. Hiriyanna—that Mankhaka notes, in his work *Śrīkantha-Charita*, a contemporary commentary on *Ishtasiddhi*, indicates the wide vogue *Ishtasiddhi* had attained to in Northern India as well about the twelfth century. Such a position could have been achieved by it only after some generations of scholars had studied it and promulgated its teachings in North and South India. It would not be extravagant if one allowed half a century for its attaining this extensive popularity. This would suggest *circa* 1050 A.D. as the latest date for the work.

So far Mr. Hiriyanna is, I think, on firm ground. But when he proceeds to assign on certain other grounds, presently to be examined, the work to about 850 A.D., it has to be remarked that that is an impossible date for it. This suggestion is based on four independent data. The first of these is that as the author of *Ishtasiddhi* quotes twice from Surēśvara's works, one of the quotations being from the latter's *Naish-Karma Siddhi* (IV-53), he "cannot be earlier than 850 A.D.", Surēśvara being reputedly a pupil of Śankara. He cannot certainly be "earlier" than 850 A.D., but the practical question is how much later than Surēśvara was the author of *Ishtasiddhi*. Obviously an author who quotes another may have come *long after* him or *immediately after* him. To state that his date is between 850 A.D. and 1150 A.D. is no doubt unobjectionable but it does not help us to any extent to settle the point whether he was nearer the latter or the former date.

The second of the data adduced by Mr. Hiriyanna is that as Sarvajñātman, a disciple of Surēśvara, refers, according to

---

20 According to tradition Rāmānuja was born in Śaka 939, which corresponds to 1017-1018 A.D., *i.e.*, 87 years *before* the initial year of Vishṇu-Vardhana's reign.

certain commentators on his *Sankshēpa-Śārīraka*, to the *Ishtasiddhi*, and as the author of the *Ishtasiddhi* quotes Surēśvara, as stated above, then it is inferable that all these three authors—Surēśvara, Vimuktātman and Sarvajñātman—" should have been contemporaries ". Mr. Hiriyanna suggests that " probably they were " contemporaries but as he concedes " that it seems somewhat risky to draw such a conclusion on the basis of what is stated by commentators who wrote several centuries later ", there is, perhaps, no need to pursue this point further. As a matter of fact, however, the original contains—as pointed out by Mr. Hiriyanna himself—" only the general expression *mukti-kōvidāh*, ' those who are well versed in the knowledge leading to release '." The commentators of Sarvajnātman, including Madhusūdana Sarasvathi, who belonged to the seventeenth century, have interpreted the word as a reference to the *Ishtasiddhi*. This is very much like the interpretation by Appaya Dīkshita of the expression *pūrvāchārya kalushitām* appearing in an introductory verse of Srīkantha's *Bhāshya* on the *Brahma Sūtra* that it is a reference to Rāmānuja's predecessors in philosophic tradition!

The third of the data furnished by Mr. Hiriyanna is that as Ānandabōdha, author of *Nyāya-Makaranda*, quotes half a sloka which is to be found in the *Ishtasiddhi* and as he prefaces the quotation with the words *etadevoktam gurubhiḥ*, " we may conclude from this," adds Mr. Hiriyanna, " though we cannot be quite sure about it, that Ānandabōdha was a disciple of Vimuktātman." He also remarks: " There is nothing improbable in this, for Ānandabōdha was an early writer on the Advaita as shown, for example, by the fact that his *Nyāya-Makaranda* has been commented upon by Chitsuka (1300 A.D.). Further, Ānandabōdha quotes more than once from the *Ishtasiddhi* and his view in regard to more than one detail of Advaitic doctrine is identical with that maintained in the latter." By this reasoning Mr. Hiriyanna suggests, though he does not put it forth definitely as a proposition, that though his date is not known, as Ānandabōdha frequently refers to Vāchaspati, whom he

assigns—agreeing with Dr. Keith[21]—to the first half of the ninth century A.D., he should have lived about that time (841 A.D.).

Mr. Hiriyanna then concludes with this final statement: "If the author of the *Ishtasiddhi* be the *guru* of Ānandabōdha, he cannot be earlier than 850 A.D., a result at which we have already arrived." Even this negative result, which does not lead us to anything like a satisfactory solution, appears to be based on rather insecure foundations. It might be suggested that Ānandabōdha's quotations from Vimuktātman are quite compatible with his being neither Vimuktātman's disciple nor a person coming shortly after him. As to the words *etadevoktam gurubhiḥ*, I would suggest that the word "*guru*" in this quotation has to be interpreted otherwise than as "a religious teacher" or "a spiritual teacher" in the sense that

---

[21] Professor A. A. Macdonell assigns Vāchaspati to a date "soon after 1100 A.D." (*Vide* his *Sanskrit Literature*, 393). Dāsgupta, however, fixes the date 898 Vikrama era, corresponding to about 841-842 A.D. (See *loc. cit.*, II. 107.) This is based on a reference in the *Nyāyasūchinibandha*, a work of Vāchaspati. Since Udayana, who lived about 984 A.D., wrote a commentary called *Nyāyavārtika tātparyatīkā parisuddhi* on Vāchaspati's *Nyāyavārtika tātparyatīkā*, which was itself a commentary on Udyōtakara's *Nyāyavārtika*, Vāchaspati must have lived anterior to 984 A.D. The *Bhāmati* mentions a king called Nriga (*Srīmannṛga*), who has not yet been identified, though Dr. Ganganath Jha suggests he was a King of Mithila, a predecessor of Nānyadēva, who ruled about 1019 Vikrama era, corresponding to 962 A.D. (See Introd. to *Sānkhyatattva Kaumudī*, a commentary by Vāchaspati on Īsvara Krishna's *Sānkhyakārikā*.) Messrs. Suryanarayana Sastri and Kunhan Raja in their *Bhāmati Chatussūtri* succinctly summarize the known facts as to the date of Vāchaspati Misra. (See Introd. ix–x.) The first of the dates suggested, *viz.*, 841—842 A.D., seems too early as it is too near 825 A.D., the date of Śankara's death. A work like the *Bhāmati* cannot have been written within 15 years of Śankara's death, some short time at least being required for the propagation of Śankara's doctrine. Udayana's date (984 A.D.) would seem to help us to a more satisfactory position. Even allowing a hundred years for the popularization of Vāchaspati's works, Vāchaspati would have to be assigned to 884, which would separate him from Śankara by about sixty years. The possibility of this date—or one near to it, say somewhere about 900 A.D.—is strengthened by the fact Nānyadēva, the alleged successor of King Nriga of Mithila, is known to have lived about 962 A.D. Remembering the fact that Vāchaspati wrote quite a large number of works, practically all of which have come down to us, and they deal with different aspects of Śankara's Advaita (as propounded by Mandana Misra), it is not impossible he lived to a fairly advanced age. *Circa* 900 A.D. seems, therefore, not altogether too fanciful a date for him.

Vimuktātman was the *guru* (*i.e.*, he who performed the purification ceremonies over him and instructed him in the Vedas, etc.) of Ānandabōdha. It is possible here that the word "*guru*" is used in the sense of "any venerable or respectable person", or simply in the sense of "venerable", "respectable", etc., as applied to a high authority on the Advaita, which would be just the sense in which the author of the *Ishtasiddhi* would be referred to by one like Ānandabōdha when quoting Vimuktātman in his own support. The words *etadevoktam gurubhiḥ* would thus mean no more than "it is thus said by the venerable authority" Vimuktātman. That the word "*guru*" is thus used commonly in the sense of "venerable" or "respectable person" will be clear from the following authorities :—Kālidāsa's *Śakuntalā*, 4, 17 ; *Bhāminīvilāsa*, 2, 7, 18, 19, 49; *Bhagavadgīta* 2, 5; and *Raghuvamśa*, 14, 46. It is unnecessary to refer to the fact that the word "*guru*" is used sometimes in a very much wider sense even, it being used to indicate "father" (*Uttararāmacharita*, 5, 28). It is just possible, Ānandabōdha means by the expression quoted no more than that the authority of Vimuktātman was, in his opinion, "irresistible" or "unassailable", the word "*guru*" in such a context meaning no more than that. If Vimuktātman had really been the *guru* (*i.e.*, the actual religious preceptor) of Ānandabōdha, the fact would have been mentioned in the colophons appearing in his different works. The admitted fact that he has not done so—remembering as one should that he quotes him in the manner he does—shows that the word "*guru*" is used in the particular context referred to above in the ordinary sense of a "great" or "venerable" or "irresistible" authority and no more.

The fact that Chitsuka has commented on Ānandabōdha's *Nyāya-Makaranda* does not and cannot prove that Ānandabōdha was so early a writer as to belong to the middle of the ninth century A.D. Chitsuka, we know, is mentioned in two inscriptions dated in 1220 and 1284 A.D. and his commentary on one of Ānandabōdha's works can only be held to prove that he came after him, though how long after he

actually came, it is difficult to state in the absence of definite evidence. The further suggestion that Ānandabōdha agrees in doctrinal matters with Vimuktātman does not and cannot establish anything more than his intellectual indebtedness to Vimuktātman—it cannot prove either his discipleship or his nearness in date to Vimuktātman. As to the date of Ānandabōdha, it is no doubt still uncertain, but as suggested in the first part of this article, he must be set down to be a successor of Prakāśātman, on one of whose (Prakāśātman's) works he has commented, which shows that he should be taken to have come after Prakāśātman. If Prakāśātman lived about 1200 (*vide* Dāsgupta, *loc. cit.*, 419), then Ānandabōdha should have lived about, say, 1250 A.D. This would make him—as already stated—an elder contemporary of Chitsuka, who in his turn commented on one of his—Ānandabōdha's—works. It would thus seem to follow that Ānandabōdha could not have lived so early as 841 A.D. and that his citation of the *Ishtasiddhi* or adoption of its views on certain doctrinal points cannot enable us to put back its date to anywhere about 850 A.D. One other point may be mentioned. Mr. Hiriyanna has assigned Prakāśātman to 1000 A.D. (see his *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, 340). If this be so, then his commentator Ānandabōdha should, as coming after him, be set down to a later date—say 1050 A.D. If this be so, then there is, as remarked already, nothing strange in Chitsuka becoming the commentator of Ānandabōdha, somewhere about the years 1220-1284 A.D., which inscriptional records yield for him. The greatest—in fact the most insuperable—objection to Vimuktātman being assigned to about 850 A.D., or any other early date near to 850 A.D., is that it would not allow sufficient time for the development of doctrine—from the time of Śankara, whom we have to set down to about 825 A.D.—which his work enshrines. On the other hand, all that we know about it, and the other difficulties inseparable from the suggestion of so early a date as 850 A.D. to the *Ishtasiddhi*, seems to point to a much later date for it. To merely suggest that the work should have been written somewhere between 850 A.D. and 1050 A.D.—the upper

and lower limits available for it—is not to say much. The real question of interest is this: Was it written nearer to 850 A.D. or nearer to 1050 A.D.? To this question, there can be only one answer in the light of the evidence available at present and that is that it should have been written nearer to 1050 A.D. rather than to 850 A.D. To say that it belongs to *circa* 1050 A.D. is to give it as near a date as is at all possible with all the evidence before us to-day.

STUDIES IN THE INDUS SCRIPTS

By S. Srikantha Sastri, M.A.

(*Continued from Vol. XXIV, No. 3, p. 230*)

II

The Vikramakhol Inscription and the Glozel Forgeries

The Vikramakhōl inscription found in the Sambhalpur district, according to Mr. Jayaswal, gives a script that is a development of the Indus script and forms a middle stage in the development of Brāhmī. Several resemblances to the script of the seals can be pointed out, but it is remarkable that almost all the characters in the Vikramakhōl inscription have a remarkable likeness to the Glozel alphabet and are nearer to Kharōshṭī than to Brāhmī. The discoveries at Glozel near Vichy in France in 1924 gave occasion to a furious controversy as to the genuineness of the finds. Drs. Elliot Smith and Reinach believed that the Glozel alphabet belonged to the neolithic epoch in Europe in about 2000 B.C. Mr. Jayaswal similarly dated the Vikramakhōl inscription as roughly of about 1500 B.C. But M. Jullian considered that there was nothing neolithic in the Glozel script and that it was merely "cursive Latin of the time of the Empire"; and it seems to be now generally accepted that the tablets are forgeries. But the remarkable resemblances between the Glozel and the Vikramakhōl scripts still remain unaccounted for, unless we consider the latter too a forgery or detect a mere accidental coincidence. But the similarities appear to me so pronounced that we have to look to some other explanation.

It is now a generally accepted fact among scholars that in the first two millenniums B.C. there was a series of linear scripts—one linear Semitic script near Sinai and another in Minoan II probably introduced by the Phœnicians. According to Reinach, the Cretan resemblances in the Glozel alphabet are beyond dispute, and probably the alphabet and pottery of Western Europe were modelled upon the linear scripts of the Mediterranean.

But the question assumes wider dimensions if the resemblances between the Glozel and Vikramakhōl inscriptions are granted. Dr. Morlet noted the almost absolute identity of the Glozel and the Phœnician archaic signs. If the affinities between the Phœnician-Glozel and Vikramakhōl scripts are proved, and if the Indus script is the progenitor of the Vikramakhōl script, it might be granted that the origin of the Cretan-Phœnician, the linear Semitic, Aramaic-Kharōshṭi scripts can be traced to the Indus pictographs. But according to Gadd, there are few resemblances between the Indus and Sumerian seals and the analogy with the Minoan is far-fetched. The seals probably contain personal names and the names are Indo-Āryan, and admittedly earlier than Sumerian.

It was suggested as long back as 1906, by Dr. Shāma Śāstri (*I.A.*, 1916) that the Brāhmī alphabet is derived from Tāntrik hieroglyphics. Several scholars more recently have urged that the Indus seals are Tāntrik amulets, and the names are those of deities like Śiva, Īśvara, Śin, etc. (*I. H. Q.*, 1932). But the original Tāntrik hieroglyphics as restored by Dr. Shāma Śāstri possess little resemblance to the characters as depicted on the seals. It is more probable that the Indus seals as well as the Vikramakhōl inscription record the celebration of animal sacrifices judging from the animals on the seals and in the inscription.

III

Vedic Evidence

In support of my contention that the Indus civilization is partly, if not predominantly, Āryan, it is already shown how the Aśvattha, etc., figure in Vedic ritual. The animal figures found on the seals as well as on the copper tablets are the so-called unicorn with the distinguishing characteristic of horns bent forward, the Brāhmaṇi bull, the rhinoceros, elephant, buffalo, tiger, crocodile, deer, goats, Gayal, composite animals, etc. In the *Taittirīya Samhita*, there are lists of animals which exactly correspond to these. To Indra, a beast with horns bent forward (prāsṛṃga), with a spot on the forehead should be sacrificed to achieve victory in war.

इन्द्राय वज्रिणे ललामं प्राश्रृंगमालभेत । यमलं राज्यायसंतं राज्यं न उपनमेत् । इन्द्रमेव वाज्रिणं स्वेन भागधेयेन उपधावति । स एवास्मै वज्रं प्रयच्छति । स एवं वज्रः भूत्वै इंधे उपैनं राज्यं नमति ललाम, प्राश्रृंगो भवति । एतद्वै वज्रस्य रूपं समृद्धयै ॥

(*Tai. Sam.*, II. 1. 3. 4.)

A dappled animal to Maruts, a spotted one to Savitṛ, a composite animal of all forms (बहुरूप) to Viśvēdēvāh, a Gayal to Vāyu (वायव्यम् गोमृगमालभेत), a goat to Agni, a boar to Indra, to Yama a deer, to Varuṇa a black deer, to the Sindhu a Śimśumāra (crocodile), a purusha-mṛga to the Moon, a lion, *nakula* and tiger to Indra, a rhino to Kāma, a dove to Samvatsara, etc., etc. (*Tai. Sam.*, V. 5. 7. 11; V. 6. 14 etc.).

वैश्वदेवीं बहुरूपामालभेत अन्नकामः । बार्हस्पत्यम् उक्षवशमालभेत ब्रह्मवर्चसकामः । रौद्रीं रोहिणीमालभेत । त्वाष्ट्रं वडबमालभेत पशुकामः । मैत्रं श्वेतमालभेत संग्रामे संयते समयकामः । आश्विनं धूम्रललाममालभेत । वायव्यं गोमृगमालभेत । etc.

It is not improbable, therefore, that the animals on the seals are representations of various sacrifices and the legends probably refer to deities or sacrificers.

IV

Tribes of the Indus Valley

It has been pointed by a scholar that the modern Harappa is probably the ancient Hariyūpīya mentioned in the *Ṛg-Vēda*. Hariyūpīya once identified with the Zhob in Mesopotamia by Hillebrandt, is more probably the Irāvāti itself and the town also must have taken its name from the river. It is also called Yavyāvati. It seems to have been the capital of the Vāraśikhas before Vṛchīvant Daivavāta; and Abhyāvartin Chāyamāna destroyed the last members of the dynasty.

एतत्यत्ता इन्द्रियम चेति
येनावधीर्वारशिखस्य शेषः ।
वज्रस्य यत्ते निहतस्य शुष्मात्
स्वनच्छिदिंद्र परमो ददार ॥

वधीदिंद्रो वरशिखस्य शेषो-
            ऽभ्यावर्तिने चायमानाय शिक्ष्यन् ।
वृचीवतो यद्धरियूपीयायाम् हन्
            पूर्वे अर्धे भियसा'परोदर्त् ॥
त्रिंशच्छतं वर्मिण इंद्रसाकं यव्यावत्यां पुरुहूत श्रवस्य ।
वृचीवंतः शरवे पत्यमानाः पात्राभिंदाना न्यर्थान्यायन् ॥
यस्य गावावरुषा सूयवस्यू
            अंतरूषु चरतो रेरिहाणाः ।
स सृंजयाय तुर्वसम् परादाद्
            वृचीवतो दैववाताय शिक्षन् ॥
द्वयामग्ने रथिनो विंशतिं गा
            वधूमतो मघवा मह्यम् सम्राट् ।
अभ्यावर्ती चायमानो ददाति
            दूणासेयं दक्षिणा पार्थवानाम् ॥

(*Ṛg Vēda*, VI. 3. 4. 8.)

In the *Bṛhad-dēvatā* (VI. 75 ff.) we are told that Abhyāvartin Chāyamāna and Prastōka, son of Sṛnjaya, being defeated by the Vāraśikhas, came to Bharadvāja and solicited his help to recover their kingdom. Bharadvāja sent his son Pāyu, who invoked Indra and Indra slew the Vāraśikhas on the banks of the Hariyūpīya. Abhyāvartin rewarded Bharadvāja whose another son Garga also praised the liberality of Prastōka (*Ṛg.*, VI. 47. 22). "Abhyāvartin Chāyamāna (son or descendant of Chāyamāna) grants to me, Oh Agni!, two damsels in chariots and twenty cattle. This donation of a Pārthava cannot be destroyed."

We learn from the *Pancha-vimśa Brāhmaṇa* (XXI. 12. 2) that Vṛchīvant not only opposed Vāraśikhas but also disputed with the Jahnus led by Viśvāmitra. In the famous Dāśarājña battle, which was fought on the banks of the Parushṇī, and which probably destroyed the city of Harappa and the power of the Vāraśikhas, that Kavi the son of Chāyamāna (who had probably inherited the kingdom which Abhyāvartin had conquered from the Vāraśikhas) cut off the banks of the Parushṇī to flood the country and he was killed by

Sudāsa. The long description of the battle of the ten kings in the VII Maṇḍala of the *Ṛg-Vēda* is of very great importance.

अर्णांसिचित्पप्रथाना सुदास
इन्द्रो गा: धान्यकृणोत्सुपारा ।
शर्धंतं शिम्युमुचथस्य नव्यः
शापं सिंधूनाम कृणोदशस्तीः ॥

पुरोळा इत्तार्वशो यक्षुरासीत्
राये मत्स्यासो निशिता अपीव ।
श्रुष्टिं शकरुर्भृगवो द्रुह्यवश्च
सखा सखायमतरद्विषूचीः ॥

आपळ्यासो भलानसो भनंता-
ऽलिनासो विषाणिनः शिवासः ।
आयो नयतसधमा आर्यस्य गव्या
तृत्सुभ्यो अजगन्यथा नून् ॥

दुराध्यो अदितिं स्रेवयंतो-
ऽचेतसो विजगृभ्रे परुष्णीः ।
मह्वा विव्यक्पृथिवीं पत्यमानः
पशुष्कवि राशयच्चायमानः ॥

ईयुरर्थं नन्यर्थं परुष्णीम्-
आशुशुश्चनेदभिपित्वं जगाम ।
सुदास इंद्रः सुतुकाँ अभिन्नान्-
अरंधयन् मानुषे वध्रिवाचः ॥

ईयुर्गावो नयवसादगोपा
यथाकृतमभिमित्रंचितासः ।
पृश्निगावः पृश्नि निप्रेषितासः
श्रुष्टिं चक्रुनियतो रंतयश्च ॥

एकंचयो विंशतिं च श्रवस्या
वैकर्णयो जनान् राजान्यस्तः ।
दस्मो न सद्मन् निशिराति बर्हिः
शूरः सर्गमकृणोदिंद्र एषाम् ॥

अथः श्रुतं कवषं वृद्धमप्सु-
अनुद्रुह्युं नित्रृणग्वज्रबाहुः ।
वृणाना अत्र सखाय सख्यम्
त्वायंतो ये अमदन्ननुत्वा ॥
विसद्यो विश्वाद्दंहिता न्येषाम्
इन्द्रः पुरस्सहसा नप्रदर्दः ।
व्यानवस्य तृत्सवे गयं भाग्
जेष्म पूरुं विदथे मृध्रवाचम् ॥
निगव्यवोऽनवो द्रुह्यवश्च
षष्टिश्शता सुषुवुः षट्सहस्रा ।
षष्टिर्वीरासो अधिषड् दुवो-
य विश्वेदिंद्रस्य वीर्याकृतानि ॥
इंद्रेणैते तृत्सवो वे विषाणा
आपो न सृष्टा अधवंत नीचीः ।
दुर्मित्रासः प्रकलं विन्मिमाना
जहुर्विश्वानि भोजना सुदासे ॥
अर्धं वीरस्य श्रुतयामनिंद्रं पराशर्धंतं नुनुदे अभिक्षाम् ।
इंद्रो मन्युं मन्युस्यो मिमाय भेजे पथो वर्तनिं पत्यमानः ॥
अध्रेण चित्तद्वेकं चकार सिंह्यं चित्पेत्वेना जधान ।
अवस्रक्तीर्वेश्यावृश्चदिंद्रः प्रायच्छद्विश्वा भोजना सुदासे ॥
शश्वंतो हि शत्रवो रारधुष्टे
भेदस्य चिच्छर्धतो विदंरंधिम् ।
मर्ताँ एनः स्तुवतो यः कृणोति
तिग्मं तस्मिन्निजहि वज्रमिंद्र ॥
आवदिंद्रं यमुना तृत्सवश्च
पात्रभेदं सर्वता तामुषायत् ।
अजासश्च शिग्रवो यक्षवश्च
बक्तिं शीर्षाणि जभ्रुरश्वयानि ॥
नत इंद्र समतयो नरायः
संचक्षे पूर्वा उषसो ननूत्नाः ।
देवकं चिन्मान्यमानं
जघंधावत्मनाबृहतः शंबरं भेत् ॥

प्रयेगृहादमम दुःस्त्वा या
पराशरः शतयातुर्वसिष्ठः ।
न ते भोजस्य सख्यं मृषंताधा
सूरिभ्यः सुदिना व्युच्छाव् ॥
द्वेनप्तुर्देववतः शतेगो-
र्द्वा रथा व धूमंता सुदासः ।
अहन्नग्ने पैजवनस्य दानं
होतेव सद्म पर्येमि रेभन् ॥
(*Ṛg.*, VII. 2. 18. 5 to 22.)

It should not be assumed that all the enemies who are called "*anindra*" were racially different from the Āryans (though some undoubtedly were), for in a verse Indra's help is invoked both against Āryan and non-Āryan enemies.

त्वं तान्निंद्र उभयानमित्रान् दासा वृत्राणि आर्या च
शूरः वधीः वना इव सुधितेभिरत्कैः ॥ (*Ṛg.*, VI. 33. 3.)

The tribes that participated in the Dāśa-rājña battle are the Śimyu, Yakshu, Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu, Pūru, Matsa, Bhṛgu, Paktha, Bhalāna, Alina, Śiva, the twenty-one clans of the Vaikarṇas and the Ajas and Śigrus who dwelt on the banks of the Yamunā and were worshippers of Indra. Some of these tribes were probably totemistic and the Indra-cult is already found in the Gangā-Yamunā region, which probably was the original Āryan home before the tribes moved westwards, as indicated in the well-known *nādī-stuti*—

इमं मे गंगे यमुने शुतुद्रुस्तोमं सचता परुष्णिया ।
असिक्निया मरुद्वृधे वितस्तायार्जीकीये श्रणुह्या सुषोमाया ॥

Prof. Langdon wrote, "In any way we may look at the problem, the Āryans in India are far more ancient than history admits. Their migration across Anatolia, where traces of them are found in the Hittite capital as early as the seventeenth century, is an hypothesis entirely contradictory to the new situation revealed by these discoveries in the Indus valley. Far more likely is it that the Āryans in India are the oldest representatives of the Indo-Germanic race." It is not unreasonable to assume that the Āryans starting from the

sacred Yamunā-Gangetic plain (still revered as the sacred Brahmarshi-dēśa by Hindus), fought a number of battles with the enemies on the banks of the Indus and its tributaries, and passed on to Sumēr. Besides the Indian seals found at Ur, Sūsa, Telloh, Kish Ummah, the positive evidence of the ruins at Tell Asmar shows clearly that by *c.* 2600 B.C. the art of India was very feebly imitated in Mesopotamia. The crude imitations of the seals bearing the figures of the elephant and the rhinoceros, etched carnelian beads, potsherds with barbotine ornamentations—all show how by the middle of the third millennium B.C. in the reign of Gimilsin of Ur, the artists of Eshnunna were no longer under the direct influence of India (*Illustrated London News*, Oct. 1, 1932). And finally the Amarna letters and Boghaz-Kāyā inscriptions of about 1500 B.C. give the latest unmistakable evidence of Āryan domination of Anatolia and the Hittite culture. The script too must have been taken by the Āryan invaders westwards (whether it was Tāntric in origin or not) as pointed out by Dr. R. Shāma Sāstri, who quotes from the *Akshamālōpanishad* (*I. A.*, 1906, p. 318).

मंत्रमातृके अक्षमाले नद्यंतरं यासि । देशान्तरं यासि । द्वीपान्तरं यासि । लोकान्तरं यासि । सर्वदा स्फुरसि । सर्वहृदि वासयसि, नमस्ते ॥

We shall revert to this question subsequently.

A NEW HYMN OF JNANA-SAMBANDHA

By T. G. Aravamuthan, M.A., B.L.

(Continued from Vol. XXIV, No. 3, p. 275)

II

Let us start at a point in the record where we may obtain a chance of restoring the damaged portions of the text. We have already noticed that in this hymn every one of the other stanzas splits into two halves with the end of the second verse; we may therefore presume that this stanza too divides into two halves,—the first and second verses going into the former half and the third and fourth verses falling into the latter. This assumption would enable us to look for clues helping to make the structure of this stanza conform to the pattern of the rest of the hymn.

Fortunately, it is almost in the vicinity of this point that we get our best clue. In line 15, after the word கொண்டவர் we have three characters[1] which are plainly சா; they are quite clear on the stone, even though the stone has peeled off a bit. These characters, it will be remembered, occur just at the spot where, if we are to judge by the type furnished by the other stanzas, we expect words similar to இடமென்பர் or பற்றும். We may, therefore, assume that the letters சா stand at the beginning of a word which may be an equivalent to இடமென்பர் or to பற்றும். Immediately after these characters appears a letter,[2] the looped hook of which at the beginning betrays it to be either a வ or an உ. It is most unlikely that in Tamil an உ follows immediately upon சா; we may, therefore, take the letter to be a வ, and find confirmation in some indistinct continuation which would seem to embody its full and proper shape. A little to the right of this letter is seen very dimly the ghost of another letter[3] which, on a close scrutiny, we may take to be the letter ம. The letters read thus far

---

[1] Characters 9, 10 and 11.

[2] Character 12.

[3] Character 14.

stand thus: சாரவ-ம. Here we have the possibility of a full-fledged word. Looking in between வ and ம, and straining our eyes we see a very faint stroke,[1]—so faint indeed that its existence is almost problematical: this stroke is the sign used for lengthening the *a* inherent in certain Tamil characters. Now, taking all the characters together, we get சாரவாம (சார்வாம்), which is not merely a full word but is also a synonym of பற்றும்,—a word which does at this point supply a deficiency which we have been feeling. Being synonymous with பற்றும், this word சார்வாம் rounds off the first half of the stanza and not only establishes that this stanza is similar in construction to the other stanzas but also marks the close of the first two verses of this stanza. Among the accepted hymns of Jñāna-Sambandha is found one in which this word சார்வாம் performs a similar function.[2]

We may now turn to the beginning of the third verse. Each verse of a stanza rhymes at the beginning with the other verses; so, it should be no surprise if the third verse of this stanza as well begins with a word rhyming with கிள்ளை the first word of the first verse, and with வெள்ளை the first word of the fourth verse. Hence it is that the previous editors of this inscription have read the succeeding words as மள்ளல். But this word has been already shown to be inappropriate to the sense, and, palæographically, it can have no place here, as will be shown presently. A little farther on, we have characters[3] which are unmistakably நெருஙகு; this reading would be plain even at the outset were it not that the stone has peeled off here, obscuring the ரு and the ங slightly. On this reading there being complete agreement between myself and the two scholars, we

---

1 Character 13.

2 விளையாததொர் பரிசில்வரு பசுபாசவே தனையொண்
தளையாயின தவிரவ்வருள் தலைவன்னது சார்பாம்
களையார்தரு கதிராயிர முடையவ்வவ னோடு
முளைமாமதி தவழும் உயர் முதுகுன்றடை வோமே.
Hymn மத்தாவரை, Tiru-Mudu-Kunram.

3 Characters 23 to 27.

have only to find out what letters might lie between சார்வாம் and நெருங்கு.

The letter[1] immediately preceding நெ of the word நெருங்கு is clearly ல, and on this too we both agree. The letter previous to that is certainly not ல; its trunk is not quite clear, but it bears by no means a similarity to ல; from the trunk springs off an addendum in the shape of a curve which betrays it to be quite another character. There is no chance, therefore, for the reading மள்ளல். Let us now compare this character with the one[2] which comes at the close of நெருங்கு. Obviously, the two are identical: this letter, then, is also a கு. If now we take the correct reading here to be குல், we must admit that it does not rhyme with கிள்ளை or வெள்ளை and cannot form part of the rhyme-word at the beginning of the third verse. The rhyme-word must, therefore, be found before some other word which may have குல் incorporated in it. In the result, we have to find in the gap[3] between சார்வாம் and குல் a word rhyming with கிள்ளை and வெள்ளை and also a word incorporating குல்.

We shall now start from குல் and work to the left. A trace of a stroke[4] is found before கு, and it may be part of a ல or a ங; whichsoever the letter might be, it should be an integral portion of a word ending in குல், for குல் by itself has no significance. But we have very few words in Tamil which end in லகுல் or in ஙகுல். Moving our eyes to the left again, we find traces of chisel-marks in a space in which two letters could easily go, but we cannot decide what the letters are that were incised at this spot; the traces that we have are quite confusing. In the first half of this space we find a short straight stroke, but its continuation is now a blotch because of the peeling off of the stone. An initial stroke of this kind being a feature of the letters ட, ப, ம, ய and ழ, we shall have to find a word which will take one of them. The letter that must have stood in the second half

---

[1] Character 22.

[2] Character 27.

[3] From character 15 to character 20.

[4] Character 20.

of the space has left no trace whatever. Considering then all the facts before us, and also the possibilities in Tamil, we cannot but fill in the gap with the letters ம and ரு. They fit in admirably. The word மருங்குல்[1] is very often met with in poetry,—especially when the context relates to women.

We are thus left to decipher only a few letters at the beginning of the third verse[2] to arrive at the rhyme-word. Just before the join of the stones, we find traces of a ள[3] which would have been much clearer but for the stone having worn away round it. Above this character, we see vestiges of a curve which converts this ள into a ளி. This letter must be preceded by a ள, for it is only then that we would have a word to rhyme with கிள்ளை and வெள்ளை;—this anticipation is found to be correct when we look at the stone, for, we are able to trace, though only with effort, hazy remnants of that letter.[4] The letter[5] to the left of this ள seems to begin with a loop characteristic of உ and வ; while உ will not do, as it yields no sense compatible with the context, வ is appropriate inasmuch as it helps to form a word வள்ளி that supplies a very apt epithet to go with மருங்குல். Not only have we early instances of this word to mean a creeper or tendril,[6] but we find it also used to describe the slenderness of ladies' waists, in

---

1 Characters 18 to 22.

2 Characters 15 to 17.

3 Character 17.

4 Character 16.

5 Character 15.

6 ஆம்பல் வள்ளித் தொடிக்கை மகளிர்

Paraṇar *Puṛa-Nāṇūṛu*, 63 (12).

முதிர்காய் வள்ளியங் காடுபிறக் கொழிய

K. P. Nap-Pūdaṇār, in *Pattup-Pāṭṭu*, v. (*Mullaip*-), 101.

பிந்தவர்மேனிபோற் புல்லென்ற வள்ளி

Māṛaṇ-Poṛaiyaṇār, in *Ain-Tiṇai-Aimbadu*, 811.

முரிந்த சிலம்பி னெரிந்த வள்ளியின்

Auvaiyār, in *Nar-Tiṇai*, 295 (1).

குரங்கூசல்

வள்ளியிணுடுமலைநாட

Muṇṛuṛai-Aṛaiyar, in *Pala-Moḷi-Nāṇūṛu*, 140 (2, 3).

earlier[1] as well as later[2] literature. More than this, we have the very phrase வள்ளி மருங்குல் used in earlier[3] and later[4] works.

We have now two phrases வள்ளி மருங்குல் ('tendril-waisted') and செவ் வாய் ('red-lipped') which obviously refer to those who are called வெள்ளை நகையார் ('damsels of pearly smile'). Between these two phrases, however, lie words which the two scholars have read as நெருங்கு மழலை. It is by no means easy to relate them, even distantly, to வாய். The other phrases in the neighbourhood are made up of a noun and a word qualifying it; வள்ளி qualifies மருங்குல், செம்மை qualifies வாய் and வெள்ளை qualifies நகையார். This is a circumstance which is really suggestive; நெருங்கு is a word which must attach itself to a noun,—especially because it is preceded and followed by phrases so compounded. The word which it must qualify cannot be மழலை, unless we can conceive of 'babbling' being 'close-set'. The reading நெருங்கு மழலை has therefore to be abandoned. How then are we to read the characters here?

There being no doubt about நெருங்கு, we have to inquire if மழலை is the proper reading.[5] There can be possibly no doubt about the letters ம[6] and லை[7], and there is, certainly, no difference between us about the readings of these letters. What,

---

[1] வள்ளி நுண்ணிடை வயின்வயி னுடங்க

Ōrambōhiyār, in *Aha-Nāṉūṟu*, 286 (2).

வள்ளிநுடங்கிடைமாதர்வந்தலர்தூற்றிட

Periya-Aḻvār, *Tiru-Moḻi*, III. ii. 7 (1).

[2] வள்ளிவென்ற நுண்ணிடை மழைமலர்த்தடங்கணூர்

Śīvaha-Śindāmaṇi, ix. 2039.

[3] வள்ளி மருங்குல் வயங்கிழை யணிய

M. K. Veṇ-Nāhaṇār, in *Puṟa-Nāṉūṟu*, 316 (9).

[4] வள்ளிமருங்குலென் தன்மடமானினைப்போதவென்று

Tiru-Maṅgai-Āḻvār, *Periya-Tiru-Moḻi*, III. vii. 1 (2).

தெள்ளியள் வள்ளிநுண்மருங்குல்

Ibid., II. vii. 5 (6).

வள்ளிமருங்குல் வருத்துவபோன்ற வனமுலையே

Māṇikka-Vāśahar, *Tiruk-Kōvai*, 128.

[5] Characters 28 to 30.

[6] Character 28.

[7] Character 30.

however, is the intermediate letter?[1] The two scholars have read it as ழ, but we have no instance anywhere of a letter of this shape standing for that sound.

Palæographical considerations enable us to decide the question. The letter we are now considering cannot be a ழ but may be a மு or a மூ. When taken with the characters before and after, we get மமுலை and மமூலை, neither of which is a Tamil word. We are, therefore, driven to explore other possibilities. The letter which we have taken to be ம may with equal possibility be a mere ம். If it is only an ம், we get ம்முலை or even ம்மூலை,—but they are words absolutely unknown to Tamil. If, however, we transfer the ம் to the previous word,—a transfer which is certainly easy because of space-quads not having been used to mark off words,—we get நெருங்கும், which is quite as good as நெருங்கு. We have, then, to choose between மூலை and முலை,—but there cannot be the least hesitation in the choice, மூலை being no Tamil word; the alternative word, முலை, is the only possible word with which to fill in the gap.

The reading here would then be நெருங்கும் முலை ('with breasts that press against each other'). This reading is eminently satisfactory, not merely because it conforms to the type of phrases in its vicinity, but also because it suits the context admirably. What is more natural or poetical than to endow 'damsels' of 'pearly smile', with waists slender as tendrils, with lips of a coral red and with swelling breasts that press against each other? The reading மள்ளல் நெருங்கு மழலைச் செவ் வாய் வெள்ளைந் நகையார் cannot stand comparison with வள்ளி மருங்குல் நெருங்கும் முலைச் செவ் வாய் வெள்ளைந் நகையார்.

It need not be pointed out that a very strong confirmation of the reading now offered is that while the other reading supposes some length of the stone surface between கொண்டவர் and மள்ளல்[2] to bear no characters whatever, the new reading serves to show that there was writing here as well, that it has only disappeared in parts and that the remnants can still be gathered together to yield an intelligible reading.

---

[1] Character 29.

[2] That is, from character 9 to character 18.

We may now pass on to line 16,—the next line. The only word on the reading of which we differ is விளி. The characters at this spot are badly damaged indeed, but yet we can trace remains of a different word. In the first place, we have room here for three letters, while விளி is made up of only two. In the second place, this word seems to have suggested itself to the two scholars because of its appearing in a similar context in the previous stanza. But we find that the poet has been, in the same hymn, varying with considerable skill the words he has been using in this context, and he has not repeated a word once used. We have thus a *prima facie* case against விளி. If we now look at the stone, we will find that the first two letters in this area may be spelt out into ந and ட, and that the third might possibly be the ghost of a ஞ. We would then have the letters நடஞ் which yields us a reading நடஞ் செய் that is certainly much happier than the other, விளி செய்.

We may now turn to a consideration of the reading of the damaged portion of line 14.

The readings offered below for this line would differ from that of the two previous editors, not so palpably as in the case of line 15, but, more subtly,—in matters literary as well as palæographical. From the literary point of view the result would be a striking improvement.

We would do well to start, as before, with an examination of the rhyme-word. The two scholars take it to be கொள்ளை[1]—which does suit the rhyme and the context. But we have only to look at the stone to discover that the last letter[2] is not ளை; the 'animation' of the consonant ள் by the vowel ஐ is shown in inscriptions contemporary with this by a symbol almost in the shape of a வ which precedes the ள and gets linked on to it. The third character in this line[3] is a ளை and its shape is incised there quite clearly; a comparison with this character must suffice to show that the letter we are now concerned with cannot be a ளை by any possibility. On the other hand, we see above the ள a curve which, though damaged, is unmistakably the sign for the இ-animation. The

[1] Characters 22 to 24. [2] Character 24. [3] Character 3.

letter, therefore, is not ளை, but ளி. The immediately preceding letter[1] is ள and on it we are agreed. What then are the letters[2] that precede it? The other reading takes it to be கொ and so assumes room for three characters, but, really, there is not space for more than two. On a careful examination of the spot we find two characters தத there.

Perhaps we may now consider the value of the letter[3] which precedes these. We are agreed about the value to be attached to the consonantal portion, which is த, but not about that of the vowel mark above it. To my eye the sharp curve in that mark which converts it from a symbol of *i* into one of *ī* is quite clear, though the stone is damaged at that spot. I would, therefore, take the correct reading to be தீ. But I agree with the two scholars in the reading of வ[4] and த,[5] two characters which precede this one. The difference, however, in respect of the reading of தீ makes it impossible to allow the word வாழ்த்தி to stand. We cannot, however, decide which the correct reading is till we settle what the letters a little before this one stand for.

The characters[6] which the two scholars make out to be கெழுவ may now be examined closely. The first character[7] is one which differs very slightly from the symbol used in this inscription, as in other records of this period, for the ெ of கெ, for, in the inner curve we find a slight indentation which really divides the inner curve into two still smaller curves. The symbol used here is not ெ but இ: the latter is undoubtedly the symbol for the independent vowel இ and ought not to be mistaken for the former which is the mark of *e* when it 'animates' a consonant. The next character[8] is certainly க and on this reading we are agreed. So, the correct reading of these two characters is not கெ but இக. Immediately before the join of the stones stands a character[9] த which evidently was missed by the two scholars on account

---

1 Character 23.
2 Characters 21 and 22.
3 Character 20.
4 Character 16.
5 Character 19.
6 Characters 11 to 15.
7 Character 11.
8 Character 12.
9 Character 15.

of its being not only very faint but also under-sized. Before this த may be faintly discerned the remains of a character[1], so faint indeed that the outline can scarcely be picked out from the pitting of the stone in the vicinity; this is ந. Once its existence is pointed out, its presence will not be denied. Putting together the letters deciphered so far,[2] we have இக - நத; but there is a character between, which has yet to be made out.

The characters in this line which we have so far deciphered[3] may be ranged thus: இக-நதவ - - - தீத் தள்ளி. Thus far we have been purely guided by palæography, but for further progress in deciphering the decayed characters we shall have to turn to literary considerations.

What is the subject-matter of the verses? Taking it that in the first two verses of this stanza we may be sure of the words கிள்ளை மொழியாளை, 'her of parrot speech,' and தலை தக்கனைக் கொண்டவர் சார்வாம் 'we are devotees unto him who took the head of Takkan̤,' and knowing as we do that this hymn on Śiva refers in every stanza to one of Śiva's exploits and also that *Takkan̤* is only the Tamilised form of the Sanskrit *Daksha* and that the Purāṇas relate a story of how Daksha's head was taken by Śiva, we can have no difficulty in concluding that these two verses and, consequently, the doubtful letters and the gaps between them in line 14, must relate to the purāṇic incident.

What then is the story? Daksha had Śiva for his son-in-law,— Umā, Śiva's consort, being none other than Daksha's daughter. A feud, however, kept father-in-law and son-in-law apart,—one of the bones of contention being Śiva's right to a share in sacrificial offerings. Just to give vent to his spleen, Daksha performed a sacrifice to which he invited Vishṇu, Brahma and the other gods, but ostentatiously refused to send an invitation to his daughter and son-in-law. Umā, however, would not forget that she was Daksha's daughter,

---

[1] Character 14.

[2] Characters 11, 12, 14 and 15.

[3] Characters 11, 12, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24.

and she invited herself. Daksha was too cross with Śiva to appreciate the gracefulness of his daughter's visit and he insisted on her taking herself off instantly. Umā felt wroth at the insult, nor was Śiva less incensed when he learnt of Daksha's churlishness. From out of the flaming eyes of the couple sprang two myrmidons of vengeance, Vīrabhadra and Bhadrakāḷi, who strode up to the pavilion where the sacrifice was being performed and peremptorily demanded for Śiva the share of sacrificial offerings to which he had been entitled as of yore. Daksha refusing, Vīrabhadra assailed the assembled gods and harried them severely, when Daksha took up his sword and entered the fray. But Vīrabhadra's sword flashed out swift and Daksha's head rolled promptly into the sacrificial fire in which it was instantly reduced to ashes. Vīrabhadra then tossed the smouldering embers of the sacrifice to the four quarters and brought the sacrifice to an ignominious end.[1]

Jñāna-Sambandha uses this story in many of his hymns to illustrate the prowess of Śiva. In almost all of those hymns the reference is very brief,[2] but we have also two hymns in which the story is given a little more fully. One of them

---

[1] Various purāṇas present this story in different versions. It is well known that almost every purāṇic story appears in a different form in every purāṇa in which it is related. But Jñāna-Sambandha and his two brother-psalmodists seem to use each purāṇic story in an unvarying form. A critical examination of the versions adopted by these psalmodists—as also by the psalmodists of the Vaishṇavite school of the Tamil country—may help us to determine the sources from which these psalmodists drew their material and also to settle, in some measure, the chronology of the evolution of the purāṇas.

[2] Here are a few examples:

தக்கன் பெருவேள்வி தன்னி லமரரைத்
துக்கம் பலசெய்து

Hymn கல்லானிழல் on Tiru-Nallam.

விதிர்த்தெழு தக்கன்றன் வேள்வியன்று
சிதைத்தவன்

Hymn எரித்தவன் on Tiru-Nallam.

தக்கனார்பெரு வேள்வியைத் தகர்த்துகந்தவன்

Hymn பீடினால் on Tiru-Aṛaiy-Aṇi-Nall-ūr.

தக்கனார் தலையரிந்த சங்கரன்

Hymn நம்பொருள் on Śī-Kāḷi.

speaks of Daksha's insult to Umā and Śiva's wrath and the dismembering of Daksha's head.[1] In the other, Śiva is said to have scattered the sacrifice of Daksha who had insulted Umā.[2]

In the light of this story we may attempt a reconstruction of the readings in the areas where we are faced with doubts.

A lady, the consort of Śiva, plays a part in this story and in the verses referring to this incident we find mention of a கிள்ளை மொழியாள், 'she of parrot speech'; we may therefore take it that the கிள்ளை மொழியாள் is none other than Śiva's consort.

What is it that happened in the story to 'her of parrot speech' which might be found expressed in the characters of இக-நதவ? The head and front of Daksha's offence was that he had treated 'her of parrot speech' with a contumely which a daughter could not forget and even a goddess could not forgive. That contumely would be fittingly expressed by the word இகழ்ந்த—a word incorporating all the characters இக-நத which we have so far deciphered. Further, that word is,

---

[1] மலைமகடனையிகழ் வதுசெய்த மதியறு சிறுமன வனதுயர்
தலையினை டழலுரு வனகர மறமுனி வுசெய்தவ னுறைபதி
கலைநில வியபுல வர்களிடர் களைதரு கொடைபயில் பவர்மிகு
சிலைமலி மதிள்புடை தழுவிய திகழ்பொழில் வளர்திரு மிழலையே
Hymn தடநிலவியமலை on Tiru-Vīḻi-Miḻalai.

[2] புகழ்மக டுணையினர் புரிகுழ லுமைதனை
இகழ்வுசெய் தவனுடை யெழின்மறை வழிவளர்
மசமது சிதைதர முனிவுசெய் தவன்மிகு
நிகழ்தரு மிழலையை நினைபவ லவரே
Hymn அலர்மகள் on Tiru-Vīḻi-Miḻalai.

The rhyme-word in the third verse has been taken to be முகம் in all the editions of the *Tēvāram*. Evidently, the word is assumed to mean the head of Daksha of which he was despoiled for insulting Umā. But this word does not yield any satisfactory meaning when taken, as it must be, with the preceding words *eḻiṉ maṟai vaḻi vaḷar*, 'reared in conformity with the resplendent Vedas.' Daksha did not indeed raise his head in battle under any sāstraic injunction. I have, therefore, adopted மகம் 'sacrifice' in place of முகம்; the reference would then be to the sacrifice of Daksha which was 'reared in conformity with the resplendent Vedas'.—Pandit M. Raghava-Aiyangar suggests to me that perhaps Jñāna-Sambandha preferred முகம் for reasons of *mōnai* but meant it however to be equivalent to மகம்.

except for a variation made for grammatical purposes, identical with the word இகழ்வு used in the same context in the two hymns of Jñāna-Sambandha which we have pointed to as embodying a passably full version of the purāṇic story. The vestiges of writing at this point do, indeed, on examination, assume the shape of a ழ[1] which gives us the word இகழ்ந்த—a word which suits perfectly the sense and the story. But we have also pittings on the stone which would seem to convert the straight downward stroke characteristic of ழ into a curve; in fact, the letter as we now have it looks almost as if ம had shot forth a straight line as well as a curve from its middle. A letter of this shape might be a mere ழ if the stroke is what was incised on the stone, or, may be a மு or a ழு or a மூ if the letter had been incised with the curve. But மு, ழு and மூ do not go into இக-ந்த, for readings such as இகமுந்த or இகழுந்த are impossible. The letter which stands at this spot has therefore to be accepted for a ழ, which, as already shown, gives us an excellent reading.

For a while we may turn to the other group of characters[2] which we have taken to be தீததளளி. Immediately after this group follows a phrase in which the taking of Daksha's head is mentioned. The purāṇic story is that Daksha's sacrifice was strewn to the winds. A Vedic sacrifice implies fire, for which the word தீ stands. The scattering of it cannot be better expressed than by the word தள்ளி which certainly the characters தளளி can with perfect accuracy indicate. The combination of the two words தீ and தள்ளி gives rise under rules of Tamil liaison to the intermediate த்.

But what are the letters[3] which must lie between இகழ்ந்தவ and தீத் தள்ளி? Just after வ[4] of the former set of characters may be discerned a stroke[5] which, at first sight, looks like the independent stroke which ordinarily does duty for the vowel mark ா as well as for the consonant ர். As இகழ்ந்தவா offers no sense, we may take the reading to be இகழ்ந்தவர், 'he

1 Character 13.
2 Characters 20 to 24.
3 Characters 17 to 18.
4 Character 16.
5 Character 17.

who insulted'. This reading may be invested with some appropriateness either by making it refer to Daksha in the 'honorific plural' or by making it include Vishṇu, Brahma and the other gods who had insulted Śiva by attending a sacrifice of which his share of the perquisites had been denied to him and to which neither he nor his consort had been invited. The sacrificial fire must then be taken to have been reared by those 'who had insulted' Śiva, but we have no warrant whatever in the story for supposing that the *yāga* was one performed by them all; it was Daksha's—and only Daksha's. We have thus to take the plural to refer honorifically to Daksha. Two points, however, ought to be noted: Daksha who was guilty of insulting Śiva's consort, is not likely to have been dignified with the honorific plural which the final ர் implies, and there is a slight break in the upper portion of the stroke which would seem to make it more probable that the letter is not an ர் but an ந். In fact, the symbol has the appearance of a ந which, having been inserted in an area already over-packed, got crushed altogether out of shape. If this is a ந, we have the word இகழ்ந்தவன், the termination of which indicates the contempt the poet felt for Daksha who had been foolish enough to insult Śiva's consort. In the two stanzas of Jñāna-Sambandha which have been already referred to Daksha is mentioned very clearly in the singular. We have therefore ample justification for accepting இகழ்ந்தவன் as the correct reading in our stanza. That the ந் used here is the dental one and not the cerebral does not render this reading improbable; throughout this inscription the former has been preferred to the latter though the latter alone is required by every rule of Tamil orthography.

The letter which follows[1] is one which would be wholly unmistakable but for a suspicion whether a portion of its outline as now visible is not due to the stone having weathered away at that spot. One part of it is clear and it makes a ழ, but the downward stroke of this letter seems to be continued in a curve. While the almost similar character in இகழ்ந்தவன்

[1] Character 18,

might have been a ழ, a மு or a ழு or a ழூ, if what was incised was a mere stroke, or, in the alternative, only a மு, inasmuch as the curve which we see faintly does not spring off from the stroke but runs merely as a continuation of it. We have no warrant for expecting a ழ at this point, as we have already ruled out readings such as வாழ்த்தி, which alone were the justification for a ழ being postulated here. The character must therefore be a மு, and the curve, instead of being due to the weathering of the stone, must have been obscured by it. To the right of this மு, and between it and தீ is a letter which is faint but is certainly a த, as is evidenced by a clear curve in the body of the letter and a faintly traceable downward stroke.[1]

If we now fill in the gaps in what we read tentatively as இக - நதவ - - - தீததளளி, we find that the correct reading is இகழ்ந்தவன் முத் தீத் தள்ளி.

Having already discussed the import of இகழ்ந்தவன் and தள்ளி, we have only to find out if the phrase முத் தீ, 'the three fires', suits the context. This phrase is a well-known term for a Vedic sacrifice which, according to the *Śāstras*, is made up of three fires. Not only does Jñāna-Sambandha himself use it in that significance[2] but we have even earlier instances.[3] The term is a direct translation of a

---

1 We may perhaps consider another possible reading. If the letter which we have read above as ழ (character 18) had not a clear downward stroke it would be an ம் or ம which, with the other letters following it, த and தீ (characters 19 and 20), would be components of a word *makat-tī* 'sacrificial fire', which would be as good as *mut-tī* in the context. This word மகத் தீ occurs in this significance in the hymn already quoted. But this reading is an absolute impossibility in our stanza for two reasons. The downward stroke characteristic of ழ and மு is clear enough and there is no room whatever on the stone for a character க between ம and த்தீ.

2 சேடர்விண் ணோர்கட்குத் தேவர்நன் மூவிரு தொன்னூலர்
வீடர்முத் தீயர்நால் வேதத்தர் வீழிமி ழலையார்

Hymn கேள்வியர் on Tiru-Vīḻi-Miḻalai.

3 தானே தரிக்கென வவரவி
யுடன்பெய் தோரே யழல்வேட் டவ்வவித்
தடவு நிமிர் முத்தீப் பேணிய மன் னெச்சில்

Pari-Pāḍal, v, 40-2,

Sanskrit equivalent, of the early currency of which innumerable examples can be given.[1] The scattering of Daksha's sacrifice is what the phrase முத் தித் தள்ளி means, and we can have no reading which could be more appropriate.

The reading we have obtained is: கிள்ளை மொழியாளை இகழ்ந்தவன் முத் தித் தள்ளித் தலை தக்கனைக் கொண்டவர் சார்வாம்: 'We are devotees unto Him who scattered the sacrifice of Daksha—who had insulted her of parrot speech—and took his head.'

This agrees very closely with the story as we have it in the purāṇas and in Jñāna-Sambandha's hymns.

Some of the readings which have been advanced here might have suggested themselves to the two previous editors had they carefully studied the evolution of the shapes of the letters ழ, ழு, மு and மூ.[2] In this inscription the symbols for the last three are almost indistinguishable. The confusion is not confined to this inscription; it is one which is present, more or less persistently, throughout the centuries from the seventh to the thirteenth. The elongation of the vowel of மு has persistently been sought to be indicated by devices such as an indentation in the உ curve or a loop at either its beginning or its close. None the less, in this inscription the symbol for மூ has lost its individuality and it is written in a form which is liable to be mistaken for மு. An effort seems also to have been made from time to time to distinguish மு from ழு by varying the respective lengths of the shafts from which the *u* curves spring off, and another device adopted for the same purpose seems to have been the use of a

---

[1] One of the sacrificial posts discovered at Īsapur bears an inscription which closes with the benediction *Priyantām agnayah :* 'May the three (or more) fires be propitious'. This inscription is attributable to the beginnings of the Christian era. (Dr. J. Ph. Vogel in *Archæological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1910-1, p. 41.)

[2] These letters occur in this inscription at various places :

மு—11:13 ; 23:5.

மூ—6:18 ; 7:32 ; 14:18 ; 15:29 ; 18:1, 3 ; 20:32 ; 21:24.

ழ—4:6 ; 8:14, 29 ; 9:2, 22 ; 11:23 ; 12:34 ; 14:7, 13 ; 18:4 ; 19:26 ; 23:28 ; 24:32, 36, 53, including the ழ in ழி.

ழு—17:55 ; 21:21 ; 22:38.

loop at the junction of the curve with the shaft as a distinguishing feature of either the one or the other of the characters. But none of these devices seems to have been persevered in nor applied consistently. We have no definite rule as to the shapes of மு and ழ and there is no fixity of shape within even one century,—though the letter மு seems to have outlines which do not change quite so capriciously. But in this inscription none of the three characters retains a distinct shape; were it not for the context we would be unable merely from the outline to say which sound a certain character represents. What is more, the shape of the letter மு in முத் தீ is to be met with in only one other place in this inscription;[1] this is perhaps why the two scholars took the character to be only a ழ, treating what looks a curve in continuation of the downward stroke as an indentation due to the stone weathering away. But about the twelfth century the letters மு and மூ assume new shapes which are almost identical with their present-day appearance. Perhaps the occurrence of the new form of மு at only two places in this inscription confirms the opinion based on other palæographical considerations, that this inscription must be attributed to the twelfth century A.D., for it is then that the old form of that letter was disappearing and the new form was coming into use.

Putting together the various suggestions advanced so far the reading of the stanza would run thus:

கிள்ளை மொழியாளை யிகழ்ந்தவன் முத்தீத்
தள்ளித் தலைதக்கனைக் கொண்டவர் சார்வாம்
வள்ளி மருங்குல் நெருங்கும் முலைச்செவ்வாய்
வெள்ளைந் நகையார் நடஞ்செய் விடைவாயே.

This reading is certainly preferable to the other as it satisfies the rules of prosody, yields better sense, eliminates the halts in the run of the verse, is much sounder palæographically, approximates quite closely to the purāṇic story and agrees with the version of it which we have in two hymns known unambiguously to be Jñāna-Sambandha's.

[1] In the middle of line 21.

The hymnists of the *Tēvāram* do not stringently observe the rules of prosody; their verses do often sin against the orthodox canons of versification. They seem to have come at a time when prosodic rules were in a state of flux, and, being psalmodists and not mere poets, they sacrificed prosodic accuracy when by so doing they could make their compositions better as canticles. The metre is a variety of *Kali-Viruttam*.[1] We cannot afford to be more precise on the prosody of a hymn of the *Tēvāram* type. This is the reason why in reconstructing the reading of the sixth stanza, stress has not been laid on arguments drawn from prosody.

Every *Tēvāram* hymn answers to a *paṇ* or melody-type. Our inscription does not tell us, however, to which *paṇ* this hymn was set. Perhaps, the *paṇ* is what is known as *takkarāham*.[2] A study of the *paṇs* to which the hymns of the *Tēvāram* are sung is long overdue.[3]

The last stanza of this hymn gives the name of the psalmodist as Ñāṉaśambandaṉ of Kāḻi. That being the name and style under which the great psalmodist of Tamil Śaivism, Jñāna-Sambandha of Śīr-Kāḻi, is described in numerous hymns of his, we have to examine if this hymn also was one of his productions.

This hymn is similar to many of Jñāna-Sambandha's hymns in metre and *paṇ*.[4] Metrical tests are inapplicable, for hymns

---

1 Vidvān Tiru-Nārāyaṇa-Aiyaṅgār would compare this hymn with Jñāna-Sambadha's hymn, நல்லார் தீமேவும் on Tirup-Pirama-puram.

2 This is the view of Mahāmahōpādhyāya V. Svaminātha-Aiyar and of Pandit S. Sōmasundara-Dēśikar, and they suggest a comparison with Jñāna-Sambandha's hymn ஓடேகலன் on Tiruv-Iḍai-Marudu.

3 When we remember that the hymns of Jñāna-Sambandha and Tiru-Nāvukku-Araśu belong to the same period as the musical treatise incised on the rock at Kuḍimiyāmalai (*Epigraphia Indica*, xii, 226-37), that it was probably one of the works of king Mahendravarman I, that having been 'curious-minded' it is not improbable that he devoted special attention to the music of the Tamil country,—and more especially to the music of the works of Tiru-Nāvukku-Araśu whose disciple he is believed to have been,—it looks worth investigating whether the rock-cut treatise throws any light on the *paṇ* system of the *Tēvāram* hymns.

4 An example has been cited already.

of this class do not follow the recognized prosodic rules. The structure of the verses is quite suggestive of Jñāna-Sambandha's authorship. The division of each stanza into two halves is a very common device of that psalmodist, and we have a number of his hymns of which the first half of each stanza closes with words similar to those in the same position in our hymn and the second half ends with the name of the *kshētra* in praise of which the hymn is sung.[1] In picturesqueness of language and sweetness of melody, this hymn is not inferior to most of Jñāna-Sambandha's compositions. Its literary qualities accord so well with those of well-known hymns of Jñāna-Sambandha that there can be little doubt of its being one of the genuine productions of that psalmodist.[2]

---

[1] For examples, see :—

Hymn மத்தாவரை on Tiru-Mudu-Kuṇṛam.
Hymn கலையார்மதி on Tiru-Aiy-āṛu.
Hymn அறையார் on Tirup-Pūvaṇam.
Hymn கள்ளார்ந்த on Tirup-Puḷḷ-Irukku-Vēḷ-ūr.
Hymn பந்தத்தால் on Tiruk-Kaḻu-Malam.
Hymn முன்னியகலை on Tirup-Puhali.
Hymn ஏடுமலி on Tiru-Naḷḷ-āṛu.
Hymn தொண்டர் on Tiruk-Kēdāram.
Hymn விடையதேறி on Tirup-Puhali.

[2] Even so cautious a scholar as Mahāmahōpādhyāya V. Svāminātha-Aiyar writes to me, 'It is certainly a decad of Jñāna-Sambandha, அது திருஞானஸம்பந்த மூர்த்தி நாயனார் பதிகமே.' Vidvān Tiru-Nārāyaṇa-Aiyaṅgār, a scholar not easily satisfied, writes to me : 'I think that this may be Jñāna-Sambandha's composition, இது சம்பந்தர் வாக்காயிருக்கலாமென்றெண்ணுகிறேன்.' Pandit M. Rāghava-Aiyaṅgār, no mean connoisseur, tells me that he is convinced that this psalm is indisputably Jñāna-Sambandha's. So too does Vidvān Kayappākkam Sadaśiva-Chettiyār, B.A., an authority on Śaiva Siddhānta [who went through the typescript of the book of which this paper originally formed a part. He incorporated this hymn, adopting my readings, in the edition of the *Tēvāram* which he brought out for the Śaiva Siddhānta Publishing Company. Later editors have followed his lead and included the hymn in the present version in their respective editions.]

STUDIES IN BIRD-MYTHS
No. XLVI

By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.

[A Few Moroccan Superstitious Beliefs about the Night Heron]

The Night Heron (*Nycticorax griseus*, Blyth) has its "crown black; plumes white; bill black; six powder down tracts; and wing and tail grey". It is found in Central and Southern Europe and Asia, the whole of Africa (including Morocco) and the greater part of North America with the West Indies. It is found throughout India, Ceylon and Burma. It is locally distributed in the better-watered tracts.

In India, this heron passes the day in large trees such as mangoes or tamarinds or in palms. Large numbers of them associate together. After sunset, they fly off to feed on fish, frogs and the like. Their flight is heavy, and they often, while flying, utter a characteristic cry, somewhat like "*qwâl*". From this call-note one name by which they are widely known in India is taken.

Its Hindi names are *Wāk*, *Kwāk*, *Tārbāglā*, *Kokrai*. In Bengali it is called *Bātchkā*.

As the Night Heron is found throughout the whole of Africa including Morocco, the people of Morocco, who are Muhammadans, are familiar with this bird. They have a few superstitious beliefs regarding this heron. On this point, Dr. Westermarck says:—

"The Night Heron (*Nycticorax griseus*) is an ominous bird. The Uläd Büäzîz believe that, if it flies towards the east, people will die: and that, if it flies towards the west, domestic animals will die. It is on the move at night."*

From an analysis of the foregoing superstitious beliefs which the Uläd Büäzîz tribe of Morocco entertain regarding the Night Heron, we find that the undermentioned root-ideas underlie them:—

---

* *Vide Ritual and Belief in Morocco.* By Edward Westermarck, Ph.D. In two volumes. London, Macmillan & Co., 1926: Vol. II, page 341.

(1) The Night Heron, like the owl, flies about at night. As the owl is, in many parts of the world and among many peoples, looked upon as a messenger of death, the Night Heron also appears to be a harbinger of death.

(2) As many races of people believe that, if an owl perches upon a house, it prognosticates that some inmate of that house will die. In a similar manner, if the Night Heron flies towards the east and the west, its flight prognosticates that men and the domestic animals living in those directions respectively will die.

(3) Most likely, the Moroccans have some beliefs which associate death with the east and the west. Apparently they have no such superstitious beliefs about the north and the south.

(4) Most likely, the black crown and bill of this bird and its grey wings and tail, as also its habit of flying about in the night, have led the Moroccans to look upon this bird as disembodied spirits of the dead which prognosticate death. Similar beliefs are entertained in Bihar and Bengal about a few black-coloured birds which fly about during the night.

(5) Curiously enough, though the Night Heron is found throughout India and in Lower Bengal, no such superstitious beliefs are entertained by the people of Lower Bengal regarding this bird.

STUDIES IN PLANT-MYTHS
No. XXIV

By Sarat Chandra Mitra, M.A., B.L.

[A Few Indian Myths about the Spanish Jessamine or the Pagoda Tree]

The Spanish Jessamine or the Pagoda Tree (*Plumeria acuminata* or *acutifolia*) belongs to the order *Apocyanaceæ*. It is also known as the Frangipani or the Life Tree. It is called *Gulachin* or *Kalki* in Hindi and goes by the name of *Khair Chāmpā* throughout the Bombay Presidency.

It has been introduced into India from Peru and is now cultivated in all the provinces of this country.

It is a small tree 10 to 12 feet high. It has large lanceolate smooth leaves measuring 9 inches long and 2½ inches broad. These leaves are borne in crowded bunches at the extremities of the stems. But these trees assume a remarkably uncouth appearance when their succulent and gouty-looking branches are destitute of leaves, as they often are during the cold-weather months. In this state they have been very aptly described by a poet, in the following words:—

> "No leaves it has, no prickly points,
> It is a mass of knotted joints."

During the hot and the rainy seasons, this tree bears, at the extremities of its succulent stems, crowded corymbs of large-sized, pure white and exquisitely sweet-smelling flowers with the interiors of their cups yellow-tinted.

It is planted round about temples and shrines. For this reason, it is called the *Pagoda Tree.*

It is especially planted in Muhammadan burial-grounds, for which reason it is sometimes designated as the *Grave-Flower*. An Anglo-Indian poet named Waterfield has, in his *Ballads*, sung the praises of this tree as a fit warder and guardian of the graves of the dead in the following lines:—

"Well have our fathers done,
Tree of the silent one
Still in thy praise shall the story be said,
Well did they, choosing thee
First of the wood to be
Warder and guardian of the graves of the dead."

The reason for the partiality shown towards this tree for planting in grave-yards appears to be the fact that when it is in full flower during the hot weather and the rainy season, they shed their fragrant flowers in profusion over the graves below, as if by way of offering floral tributes to the spirits of the dead.

It is called the *Life Tree* in Ceylon. The Sinhalese Buddhists use its flower as a favourite floral offering in their worship. They regard this tree as *an emblem of immortality* on account of its wonderful power of leafing and even blooming when its stems are broken off from the parent tree and, without being planted in the soil, are kept in the shade.*

The follicles of this tree are dark and rigid and are about six inches long. But, for some reason, they seldom produce seeds. The *mâlis* or Indian gardeners narrate a myth to the effect that the seeds of this tree are eaten therefrom by the cobras. In many places, its seeds are boiled in milk and administered as an antidote in cases of snake-bite.

From a study of the foregoing beliefs and myths about this tree, we find that—

(1) The Buddhists of Ceylon were accurate observers of natural phenomena.

(2) They saw that if cuttings of this tree were placed in the shade without being actually planted in the soil, they still put forth leaves and even bore blossoms. They, therefore,

* *Vide Familiar Flowering Trees in India.* By Ida Colthurst. Calcutta and Simla: Thacker Spink & Co., 1924. Pages 87–90.

Also see Firminger's *Manual of Gardening in India.* By J. Cameron, F.Z.S. Fifth Edition. Calcutta: Thacker Spink & Co., 1904. Page 497.

jumped to the conclusion that this tree possessed vitality in an extraordinary degree and, therefore, conferred upon it the designation of the "*Life Tree*".

(3) As a corollary to this belief, the Sinhalese Buddhists have come to regard this tree as being immortal and, therefore, regard it as an emblem of immortality.

(4) *This tree seldom produces seeds* and are very easily propagated by means of cuttings. This fact must have struck the *mâlis* or Indian gardeners who are mostly ignorant and possess no knowledge of the principles of biology. To account for this absence of the seeds, these ignorant *mâlis* have fabricated the myth that these seeds are eaten from the trees by cobras. This is a myth pure and simple, for cobras never eat vegetable products but live upon batrachians, fishes, little birds and eggs. It is strange and curious that, of all snakes, the *mâlis* should have selected the cobra as feeding upon the seeds of this tree. They might as well have alleged that some invisible birds ate its seeds, by which reason, this tree never bore seeds. This item of folklore will have to be inquired into further by folklorists. Should any gentleman be able to find out the true idea which underlies this belief, the writer of this article will be greatly obliged if he will communicate to this *Journal* the result of his investigations into it.

(5) If the *mâlis*' belief that the cobras eat the seeds of this tree, has as its basis any substratum of fact, the reason for the use of its seeds (boiled in milk) as an antidote in cases of snake-bite, is not far to seek. If the seeds possess any property which attracts cobras, they may also possess some property which will counteract the venom of these ophidians. The question, therefore, arises as to whether this belief in the efficacy of the seeds of the *Plumeria acuminata* as an antidote to cobra-venom, prevails in other parts of India. Should any gentleman have any further information upon this item of folklore, he will greatly oblige the present writer by communicating his information to the pages of this *Journal*.

(6) As has been already stated above, there is a special fitness of the *Pagoda Tree* for being planted round about temples and pagodas. Not only are they very easily propagated by cuttings, but they bear a profusion of sweet-smelling flowers during the hot-weather months and in the rainy season when many Hindu religious festivals and ceremonies are held and performed. For the purposes of these religious ceremonies, garlands of flowers and loose floral offerings are required and the profuse flowers of this tree readily furnish the materials for their garlands and offerings. This tree has, therefore, been very appropriately given the appellation of the *Pagoda Tree.*

(7) Among all civilized peoples, flowers have been regarded as very suitable offerings to the dead. Among Christians, wreaths and crosses of flowers are placed upon the coffin when the same is taken for burial. For the same reason, these floral tributes are annually placed upon the graves of the dead at the anniversaries of the deaths of nearest and dearest ones. Among the Hindus, wreaths and bouquets of flowers are placed upon the bier when the corpses are borne away for cremation. I have already stated above that the Spanish Jessamine or the Frangipani tree, when in full flowers, bestrews the ground with its numerous sweet-smelling flowers. For this reason, it is eminently fitted for planting over the graves of the dead, for it will daily and spontaneously offer its floral tributes to the spirits of the dead. It has, therefore, been very aptly named the *Grave Flowers.*

(8) The designation which the Sinhalese Buddhists apply to the Pagoda Tree or Frangipani is "*Life Tree*" which is equivalent to "*the Tree of Immortality*". The question, therefore, arises: Is there any myth or tradition about a "Tree of Immortality" among any other Indian race? The answer to this question is not far to seek. For we find that there is in Hindu mythology a tradition about an immortal "*Kadam Tree*" (*Anthocephalus cadamba*). It is narrated that there was an immense lake named Kāliyadaha which was infested by a gigantic snake named Kāliyanāga. This monster's breath was

so venomous that any living being or animal or plant that came within a distance of 5 *kroses* of it was killed by its venomous breath. In the midst of this lake there was an island on which grew a *Kadam Tree*. On one occasion the divine bird Garuḍa, after feeding upon *amrita* or ambrosia, had perched upon it. Now it so happened that a drop of ambrosia fell from the bird's beak upon this tree and made it immortal. Consequently this tree was not destroyed by Kāliyanāga's venomous breath. Ultimately this monstrous snake was killed by the divine cowherd Śrī Kṛishṇa.

NOTES

A Study of Kulottunga Cholan Kovai.

POETS have sung about a few of the later Chōḷas only, though there were many of them constituting a long line of kings from the ninth to the thirteenth century. In the Praçasti of inscription No. 41 of 88,[1] it is said that Rājādhirāja, the illustrious son of the empire-builder Rajēndra Chōḷa I, better known as Gangaikoṇda Chōḷa, was celebrated in a *Paraṇi* called *Koppaitu-p-paraṇi* for the victory he gained over the Western Chālukyās at Koppam. His brother Vīrarājēndra also got a *Paraṇi* for the success over them at Kūdalsangamam, a town near the confluence of a tributary of the Krishṇa with the main river. Both these works are not now available to us. Kulōttunga Chōḷa I was praised in a *Paraṇi* called *Kalingattu-p-paraṇi*[2] from the pen of the famous poet Jayagondān, portions of which have been translated and published in the *Indian Antiquary* long ago. The famous poet Otta-k-kūttan has sung about three successive kings, Vikrama Chōḷa, Kulōttunga Chōḷa II and Rāja-Rāja Chōḷa II in a series of poems. Kulōttunga III too has been celebrated in a poem called *Kumāra Kulōttungan Kōvai*,[3] the author of which is not known. All these poems contain valuable historical material. As already mentioned Kavi-c-chakravarthi Otta-k-kūttan was the author of a number of poems on the three Chōḷa kings during whose reigns he lived. *Vikrama Chōḷan ula*, *Kulōttunga Chōḷan ula*, *Rājarāja Dēvar ula*, *Kulōttunga Chōḷan Piḷḷaittamiḷ*, *Takkayāga-p-paraṇi* are some of them. All these poems except *Kulottunga Chōḷan Piḷḷaittamiḷ* have already been published and are available in print. *Kulōttunga Chōlan Piḷḷaittamiḷ* alone was not available till now.

---

1 இலங்கைக்கரசசையும் அலங்கல் வல்லவனையும்
கன்ன குச்சி காவலனையும்
பென்னணி முடித்தலை தடிந்துதன் கொடிப்படையொடு
கன்னுடகர்விடு கடகரிபுரளத்
தன்னுடையிற் றமிழ் பரணிகொண்டு, *S.I.I.*, IV, 22.

2 Edited by A. Gopala Iyer, Tamil Pandit, Madanapalli College.

3 Published by Ramaswamy Kavirayar, Tirupparankunram, Madura.

From a perusal of this work which has now been edited by Pandit L. Olaganatha Pillai and published by Sadasivan Brothers, Mylapore, we find that it contains a mine of historical information. Verse 2 of the poem states that the presiding deity in the Madura Temple composed *Irayinar Agaporul*—a treatise on subjectives. It only reiterates the tradition found in *Kalaviyal*,[4] which was supposed to be the work of God Himself. The singing of *Kaḷavaḷi*[5] by Poygayār from the liberation of the Chēra king Yānai-k-kat-cēy-Māntaramsēral Irumporai is mentioned in verse 102. The traditional story found in the three *Ulas* and in *Thirukalukunrapuranam* that Suraguru devised the earthen urns is referred to in verse 39. The piercing of the eye of Mukari,[6] a refractory king, who did not obey the orders of Karikālan for bringing labourers to embank the Cauvery, is also mentioned in verse 53. The famous king Rājēndra Chōḷa Dēva, son of Rāja Rāja the Great, had the titles of Mudikonda Chōḷa and Panditha Chōḷa, and we find the same corroborated by verses 12 and 42. His conquest of Java, Sumatra and Malay[7] Peninsula is also referred to in verses 12 and 92. The interminable wars waged by the Chōḷas against the Western Chālukyās are alluded to in many of the verses. The exploits of the Rājādhirāja and Rājēndra are mentioned in verses 39 and 68. We know from *Vīrasoliyam* that Vīrarājēndra had the title of Karikālan.[8] Not only is this statement confirmed by stanza 59 but we are told his victories over the Chālukyās were celebrated in a *Paraṇi*. The wars waged by Kulōttunga I against Chālukya Vikramāditya VI are well described in verses 12, 13 and 101. We read in verse 14 about the wars with the Kaḷingas. Mention is also made of *Kalingattu-p-paraṇi*, and the author of that work Jayankondār is said to be the *Kavi-c-chakravarthi*—prince of poets—of his time. Verse 19 mentions the overthrow of Vairāgaram. One outstanding

---

[4] Published by S. Bavanandam Pillay, Madras.

[5] Edited by V. Anantarama Aiyar, Mylapore, Madras.

[6] See *Kalingattu-p-paraṇi*, where the same fact is mentioned.

[7] See his inscriptions and the article "Jayankonda Chōḷa" in the *Journal of Indian History*, II, part 3.

[8] *Vīrasoliyam*, 187.

feature found in verses 1 and 42 about Kulōttunga I is the corroboration of the statement found in the *Kalingattu-p-paraṇi* (223 and 225) that the queen of Rajēndra Chōḷa-Dēva remarked on seeing her grandson (daughter's son) as soon as he was born, that he would be her son and reign as the emperor of the Chōḷas in succession to her husband. Whether this is true or a poetical fancy to explain the succession of Kulottunga I is not yet proved. The second and third wars waged by Vikrama Chōḷa, father of our hero, is told in verses 9 and 88. These victories have been celebrated by a *paraṇi* sung by Kavi-c-chakravarthi himself, a fact which finds mention in verses 68 and 88. This is corroborated by references in *Kulottungacholan ula* and *Takkayāga-p-paraṇi*. In an inscription found at Tirumalavādi,[9] a sacred Śaiva shrine on the northern bank of the Coleroon, it is said that Vikrama Chōḷa renovated the temple at Chidambaram, painted the *vimāna* with gold and did some other repairs. This fact is mentioned in verse 92 of this peom.

Now coming to the hero of the poem, he is said to have been the son of Vikrama Chōḷa who reigned from 1118 to 1133 A.D., by a Pāndya princess. This princess was the second daughter of the then Pāndya king (2 and 55). Kulōttunga's original name was Edirili-p-perumaḷ. His tutor was the poet Otta-k-kūttan. He was a great patron of letters and made innumerable gifts including precious gems (41). He is said to have not only patronized learned men but also showed sympathy towards men of indifferent learning (62). This statement falsifies the story that the poet Otta-k-kūttan sacrificed annually with the connivance of his king, poets of mediocre ability and men of indifferent learning to the Goddess Kāḷi on the Sarasvathipūja day. One of his Praçastis begin with *Pūmannu*.[10] Here also the first verse begins with the same word.[11] He was generally known by the title Abhaya. This title is found

---

9 *S.I.I.*, III, No. 79.

10 பூமன்னு பதுமம் பூத்தவேழுலகுந்
தாமுன்செய் தவத்தால் பருதிவழித் தோன்றி
* * *

11 பூமன்னு பொழிலேழுங் கடலேழுங் கடவுட்
பொருப்பேழு மெண்ணிலவு..................

in twenty-five verses of this poem and in three places of the *Ula*. It is said that he was the patron of Sēkkiḷar—author of *Periya-purāṇam*, story of the 63 Śaiva saints—and at his instance this work was sung. As the name Anapāyā is found in many places in *Periyapurāṇam* and Kulōttunga II is said to possess the title, they come to the conclusion that this king should have arranged for the appearance of that work. But this title *Anapāyan* does not find place as the other title in the two poems sung by a contemporary poet of his times. Moreover *Thiruthondathokai*, a hymn sung by Sundarar, the piece on which the whole of *Periyapurāṇam* is built, was arranged to be sung in the Chidambaram temple itself by Rājēndra Chōḷa[12] nearly a century before the commencement of the reign of Kulōttunga II. These facts with others go to prove a long way the improbability of Sēkkiḷar having been patronized by Kulōttunga II.

On reading the whole poem, one gets the impression that Kulōttunga II was a powerful king wielding sway over the entire Chōḷa empire which was consolidated by his forefathers.

SOMA SUNDARA DESIKAR.

Rasimanas.

THE time of oblique ascension of each sign of the zodiac above the horizon is being erroneously valued by most of the astrologers irrespective of the latitude of the place for which they have to ascertain the same. As a result of this, their conclusion becomes otherwise than what it ought to be. From a study of *Surya Siddhānta*, the great astronomical work of India, we will understand that the equator runs through Lunka and that " Rasimanas " or the time of ascension of each sign above the horizon is fixed for Lunka with a direction to give effect to some change called " Charakhanda " to every degree of latitude on either side of it. The same theory is available in the western astronomy also. Obviously the "Rasimanas" are not common throughout the land, but vary from one latitude to another.

---

[12] *South Indian Inscriptions*, IV.

With a view to facilitate the public to ascertain the ascension of the zodiacal sign and its degree for the given time in places situated on different latitudes comprising India, the following table is prepared on the basis indicated in *Surya Siddhānta*. The figures given in the table are in "Ghatis" and "Vighatis". One Ghati is equal to 24 minutes and one Vighati to 24 seconds.

Readers may ascertain the latitude of the given place from a reference to the map of India and then work out the rising sign and its degree, adopting the "Rasimanas" shown against that latitude in the following table.

Latitude	Mesha	Vrishabha	Mithuna	Kataka	Simha	Kanya	Tula	Vrischika	Dhanus	Makara	Kumbha	Meena	Important place on the latitude
0	4-38	4-59	5-23	5-23	4-59	4-38	4-38	4-59	5-23	5-23	4-59	4-38	Lunka.
1	4-36	4-57	5-22	5-24	5- 1	4-40	4-40	5- 1	5-24	5-22	4-57	4-36	
2	4-34	4-55	5-22	5-24	5- 3	4-42	4-42	5- 3	5-24	5-22	4-55	4-34	
3	4-31	4-53	5-21	5-25	5- 5	4-45	4-45	5- 5	5-25	5-21	4-53	4-31	Sea.
4	4-29	4-52	5-20	5-26	5- 6	4-47	4-47	5- 6	5-26	5-20	4-52	4-29	
5	4-27	4-50	5-19	5-27	5- 8	4-49	4-49	5- 8	5-27	5-19	4-50	4-27	
6	4-24	4-49	5-19	5-27	5- 9	4-52	4-52	5- 9	5-27	5-19	4-49	4-24	Galle.
7	4-22	4-47	5-18	5-28	5-11	4-54	4-54	5-11	5-28	5-18	4-47	4-22	Colombo.
8	4-20	4-45	5-17	5-29	5-13	4-56	4-56	5-13	5-29	5-17	4-45	4-20	Habavani.
9	4-18	4-43	5-16	5-30	5-15	4-58	4-58	5-15	5-30	5-16	4-43	4-18	Rameswar.
10	4-16	4-41	5-16	5-30	5-17	5- 0	5- 0	5-17	5-30	5-16	4-41	4-16	Madura.
11	4-14	4-39	5-15	5-31	5-19	5- 2	5- 2	5-19	5-31	5-15	4-39	4-14	Mayavaram.
12	4-12	4-38	5-14	5-32	5-20	5- 4	5- 4	5-20	5-32	5-14	4-38	4-12	Mysore.
13	4- 9	4-36	5-14	5-32	5-22	5- 7	5- 7	5-22	5-32	5-14	4-36	4- 9	Madras & Bangalore.
14	4- 7	4-34	5-13	5-33	5-24	5- 9	5- 9	5-24	5-33	5-13	4-34	4- 7	Penukonda.
15	4- 4	4-32	5-13	5-33	5-26	5-12	5-12	5-26	5-33	5-13	4-32	4- 4	Bellary.
16	4- 2	4-30	5-12	5-34	5-28	5-14	5-14	5-28	5-34	5-12	4-30	4- 2	Kurnool.
17	3-59	4-28	5-12	5-34	5-30	5-17	5-17	5-30	5-34	5-12	4-28	3-59	Wadi.
18	3-57	4-26	5-11	5-35	5-32	5-19	5-19	5-32	5-35	5-11	4-26	3-57	Vizianagar.
19	3-54	4-24	5-11	5-35	5-34	5-22	5-22	5-34	5-35	5-11	4-24	3-54	Bombay.
20	3-51	4-22	5- 9	5-37	5-36	5-25	5-25	5-36	5-37	5- 9	4-22	3-51	Aurangabad.
21	3-49	4-20	5- 7	5-38	5-38	5-28	5-28	5-38	5-38	5- 7	4-20	3-49	Nagpur.
22	3-46	4-18	5- 6	5-40	5-40	5-30	5-30	5-40	5-40	5- 6	4-18	3-46	Bhavanagar.
23	3-44	4-16	5- 5	5-41	5-42	5-32	5-32	5-42	5-41	5- 5	4-16	3-44	Ujjain.
24	3-42	4-14	5- 4	5-42	5-44	5-34	5-34	5-44	5-42	5- 4	4-14	3-42	Katni.
25	3-39	4-12	5- 3	5-43	5-46	5-37	5-37	5-46	5-43	5- 3	4-12	3-39	Gaya.
26	3-37	4-11	5- 2	5-44	5-47	5-39	5-39	5-47	5-44	5- 2	4-11	3-37	Gwalior.
27	3-34	4- 9	5- 2	5-44	5-49	5-42	5-42	5-49	5-44	5- 2	4- 9	3-34	Agra.
28	3-32	4- 7	5- 1	5-45	5-50	5-45	5-45	5-50	5-45	5- 1	4- 7	3-32	Aligarh.
29	3-29	4- 5	5- 0	5-46	5-53	5-47	5-47	5-53	5-46	5- 0	4- 5	3-29	Meerut.
30	3-27	4- 3	5- 0	5-46	5-55	5-49	5-49	5-55	5-46	5- 0	4- 3	3-27	Haridwar.
31	3-25	4- 1	4-59	5-47	5-57	5-51	5-51	5-57	5-47	4-59	4- 1	3-25	Jalundar.
32	3-23	3-59	4-58	5-48	5-59	5-53	5-53	5-59	5-48	4-58	3-59	3-23	Amritsar.
33	3-21	3-57	4-58	5-48	6- 0	5-56	5-56	6- 0	5-48	4-58	3-57	3-21	Jhelum.
34	3-19	3-54	4-57	5-49	6- 1	6- 0	6- 0	6- 1	5-49	4-57	3-54	3-19	Peshawar & Srinagar.

H. N. SUBBA RAO.

EDITORIAL

THE celestial Hierarchies of Dionysius the Areopagite based on passages from the two Testaments and embodying the essential principles of the Neoplatonic teachings have been translated from the original Greek and published by the Editors of the *Shrine of Wisdom* in their 1933 Winter Number. These hierarchies are divided into three Triads, the Seraphim, Cherubim and Thrones which are nearest to the Godhead ever dwelling in the vestibule of Divinity ; the Dominions, Virtues, and Powers which are given the middle place as indicating the ordered governance of Providence ; and the Principalities, Archangels and Angels representing the final execution of the work of Providence. The translation and an article on the Neoplatonic teachings on prayer by Iamblichus, Proclus, Hierocles and Dionysius himself are thought-provoking. Iamblichus mentions three chief species of prayer, the collective, the connective and the unitive. Proclus while dealing with part of the doctrine of the former gives expression to some very lofty and beautiful teachings. And Hierocles' views are 'Betake yourself to the work having implored the Gods to bring it to perfection'.

***

The late Swami Shivananda whose recent demise at Belur is mourned all over India and elsewhere is the author of a short article on Pranayama in the *Prabuddha Bharata* for January 1934. The Swamiji says that Pranayama comes of itself to those who repeat the Lord's holy name and think and meditate on Him with devout and intense longing. He asks "Is it by mechanical Pranayama alone that one can realize God?" and answers the question with an emphatic 'No'. He argues that when the heart is filled with an intense longing for God, respiration almost stops and the Sadhaka repeats holy names and devotional songs and meditates necessarily coupled with great concentration. That condition of respiration is what is called Pranayama.

***

In the same issue of the journal are published some more interesting articles and we would particularly direct the attention of readers to 'The Light of the Self' based on Sankara's commentary on the Brihadaranyaka by Swami Madhavananda.

***

The Register of Tippoo's dreams written in Persian is housed in the India Office Library and R. L. Mégroz makes a study of six of them which have been translated into English in the *Aryan Path* (January 1934). The author has contributed two articles on the subject of dreams in two previous issues in 1931 and 1932 and evidently will contribute more. Mr. K. Chandy while presiding over the Annual Meeting of the Mythic Society (in 1927) suggested that a deep study into dream psychology might be undertaken by some students. Apart from this aspect, a complete translation of Tippoo's dreams by some scholar who has easy access to the India Office Library would certainly be a very useful work for a study of the personality of Tippoo himself. The study under reference reveals that devotion to his faith caused Tippoo subsequently to be ranked by Mahomedans as a martyr. The dreams recorded show no more than that the wish is father to the thought and confirms several of Tippoo's known traits of character.

***

Rai Bahadur Joges-Chandra Ray gives the first instalment of an article on a very interesting subject "Food and Drink in Ancient India" in the *Man in India* (XIII—4). The paper has been divided into three chapters dealing respectively in food grains known from the earliest times to the sixteenth century A.D., food and provisions, and intoxicating liquors. The author's chief source of authority seems to be Kautilya while the Vedic literature, the Smṛtis, the Puranas and other Sanskrit works have been freely drawn upon. This article together with Mr. Ray's Lectures on "Ancient Indian Life" published in the *Calcutta Review* in 1927 and his promised article on the "Soma Plant" would form a very valuable contribution to Indian Ethnography.

***

The cult of nudity is an absorbing subject. The earliest man went about naked without a thought. Clothing the body with twigs and leaves and later, skins and cloth was probably devised for warmth and convenience, and from small beginnings we arrive at the mediæval times when as much of the body was covered as could conveniently be done. And now, we have the revolt of modern times particularly in the West where it is nothing strange for a respectable girl to go in a single bathing costume. But these transformations have gone on differently in different parts of the world as custom and convention have gone on changing. We have an article on the subject in the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Bombay* (XV—3) in which Mr. R. P. Masani discusses the subject as it relates to India where the nude Jain ascetics are adored and nudity plays an important part in magical medicine and in ritual. One would welcome an exhaustive and authoritative treatise on the subject viewed from all aspects and embodying the cult as practised at different times and in different countries all over the world and including the psychological changes that have taken place in human minds about nudity and clothing.

Books received during the Quarter ending 31st March 1934

Presented by :—

University of Madras—

Some Aspects of the Vayu Purana—by V. R. R. Dikshitar.

Pushpadanta Puranam of Gunavarma (Madras University Kannada Series No. 4)—by Rao and Ayyangar.

Vijayanagara—by N. Venkataramanaiya.

University of Dacca—

Annual Report for 1932-33.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., Madras—

Indian History for Matriculation—by K. P. Mitra.

Government of Mysore—

Mysore Health Quarterly Report—December 1932.

Stores Purchase Committee Report—1932-33.

Administration Report—1932-33.

Joint-Stock Companies Report—1932-33.

Geological Department Report—1932-33.

Civil Veterinary Department Report—1932-33.

Proceedings of the Mysore Legislative Council—Budget Session—June 1933.

Police Department Report—1932-33.

Civil Justice Report—1932-33.

Criminal Justice Report—1932-33.

Department of Public Works Report—1932-33.

Revenue Department Report—1932-33.

Health Quarterly—1-9-1933.

Co-operative Societies Report—1932-33.

Industries and Commerce Report—1932-33.

Live-Stock Report—1932-33.

Sir Charles Todhunter—

Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Vol. XVI.

Vedic Research Institute, Poona—

Rgveda-Samhita with Commentary of Sayanacharya, Vol. I, Mandal I—by N. S. Sontakke.

The Authors—

A Guide to the Pictures in the Government House and Lalita Mahal at Mysore—by C. Hayavadana Rao.

Elements of Logic (Tamil)—by S. Gnanaprakasar.

B.B.R.A.S., Bombay.

Report for 1932.

Director of Industries and Commerce in Mysore—

Indo-Sumero-Semitic-Hittite Problems, Part I—by R. S. Vaidyanatha Iyer.

Smithsonian Institution, Washington—

Evidence of Indian Occupancy in Albemarle County, Virginia (S.M.C., Vol. 89, No. 7)—by David I. Bushnell, Jr.

Government of India—

South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. VII (Archæological Survey of India: New Imperial Series, Vol. LIII)—by K. V. Subrahmanya Iyer.

South Indian Epigraphy: Annual Report—31-3-1931.

Mr. F. R. Sell—

Mysore University Magazine, Vol. I.

Do. do. II.

Karnataka Historical Association, Dharwar—

Annual Report for 1932-33.

V. R. Sastrulu & Sons, Madras—

Mahabharata (Southern Recension)—by P. P. S. Sastri.

Government of Travancore—

Archæological Report for 1931-32.

University of Mysore—

Annual Report for 1932-33.

Purchased:

History of the English People, Vol. I.

Do. do. II.

Do. do. III.

Do. do. IV.

—by G. R. Green.

Indian Annual Register, 1933, Vol. I—by Mitra.

423-34 Printed at The Bangalore Press, Bangalore City, by T. Subramania Aiyar, Superintendent.